UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD

WASHINGTON, D. C.

July 14, 1922.

Miss C. R. Barnett,

Librarian of Department.

Dear Miss Barnett:

In accordance with your request of the 13th instant, I transmit herewith, for the permanent files of your office, a copy of the stenographic report of the Plant Quarantine Conference of May 15 and 16, 1922.

Yours very truly,

R. A. Ashouse

Assistant to the Chairman.

(Enclosure)

INDEX OF STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF PLANT QUARANTINE CONFERENCE
MAY 15-16, 1922

INDEX OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON PLANT QUARANTINE LEGISLATION
MAY 15-16, 1952

REPORT OF

CONFERENCE TO CONSIDER THE ADVISABILITY OF ANY MODIFICATIONS---ADDITIONS TO OR DEDUCTIONS FROM---OF THE CLASSES OF PLANTS PERMITTED ENTRY UNDER PERMIT FOR IMMEDIATE SALE UNDER REGULATION 3 OF QUARANTINE 37.

HELD BY

THE FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD

10 a.m., May 15, 1922.

Auditorium, New National Museum,
Washington, D.C.

Reported by W. M. Daish and C. A. Locke.

A conference, for the purpose of considering the advisability of any modifications--additions to or deductions from--of the classes of plants permitted entry under permit for immediate sale under Regulation 3 of Quarantine 37, was held before the Federal Horticultural Board at 10 a.m., May 18, 1922.

PRESENT: Henry C. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture.
E. D. Ball, Director of Scientific Work.
M. B. Cashman, Pres., American Association of Nurserymen.
J. C. Whitten, Horticulturist, University of California.
A. F. Woods, President, Maryland University.

C. L. Marlatt, Chairman, Federal Horticultural Board.
W. A. Orton, Vice-Chairman.
Geo. B. Sudworth.
Karl F. Kellerman.
R. C. Althouse, Assistant to the Chairman.

Agricultural Legislative Committee of California,
R. N. Wilson, Executive Secretary.

American Association of Nurserymen,
Orlando Harrison, Chairman, Legislative Committee, (Also representing the fruit tree and shade tree interests.
Berlin, Md.

American Bulb Co.,
A. Miller, President, (Importer)
172 No. Wabash Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

American Farm Bureau Federation,
Edwy B. Reid.

American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists,
A. L. Miller, Jamaica, L. I.
S. S. Pennock, President, Philadelphia, Pa.
John Young, Secretary, Jamaica, L.I.

American Orchid Society,
Albert C. Burrage, President,
Boston, Mass.

American Plant Pest Committee,
Harris A. Reynolds, Secretary,
4 Joy St., Boston, Mass.

American Plant Propagation Association,
The D. Hill Nursery Co., (Represented by V.D. and A.H. Hill)
Dundee, Ill.

Severn A. Anderson, (Representing Florists on the Canadian Border.)
Buffalo, N.Y.

Andorra Nurseries,
Wm. Warner Harper,
Philadelphia, Pa.

F. L. Atkins, (Nurseryman.)
Rutherford, N.J.

The W. W. Barnard Co.,
Ralph B. Howe, President,
231-5 W. Madison St.,
Chicago, Ill.

Milton H. Bickley, (Grower and Importer)
Wallingford, Del. Co., Pa.

Boot & Co.,
M. C. De Wreede, (Bulb Importer) Voorhout,
Oakwood Heights, Staten Island, N.Y. Holland.

Breck-Robinson Nursery Co.,
Luther A. Breck, President,
Lexington, Mass.

Joseph Brick & Sons Corp.,
Boston, Mass.

Carrillo & Co., Inc., (Orchid Growers.)
Luis F. Carrillo,
Mamaroneck, N.Y.

Chase Nursery Co.,
Henry B. Chase, (Nurseryman.)
Chase, Ala.

John Lewis Childs, Inc., (Seedsman & Florist.)
Arthur H. Goldsmith, Vice President & General Manager,
Floral Park, Nassau Co., N.Y.

Chilcott Bros., (Fruit Growers)
E. C. Chilcott, (U. S. Department of Agriculture)
Vienna, Va.

Cottage Gardens Co., (Nursery)
R. T. Brown, Vice President,
Queens, N.Y.

Franklin Dan's Nursery Inc.,
W. T. Cralle,
Baltimore, Md.

J. H. Dayton, (Nurseryman),
Painesville, O.

S. Derunson, (Seedsman)
Chicago, Ill.

Henry A. Dreer, Inc., (Affiliated with Society of American Florists.)
J. D. Eisele, President,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Eastern Nurserymen's Association,
Lester C. Lovett, Vice President, (Nurseryman. Member American
Little Silver, N.J. Association of Nurserymen)
J. Edward Moon, President.

Eddy & De Wreede, (Importers and Distributers, Bulbs)
John R. Eddy,
Paradise, Lancaster Co., Pa.

J. Frank Edgar, (Florist.)
Waverley, Mass.

Edward Flower Co.,
Theo. E. Edward, Prop.,
Bridgeton, N.J.

Wm.W. Edgar Co., (Florist)
H. H. Bartsch, President,
Waverley, Mass.

Elliott Nursery Co.,
R. F. Elliott, President,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

R. & J. Farquhar Co., (Nurserymen & Seedsmen)
Alexander P. Dewar, President,
Boston, Mass.

Florida State Horticultural Society,
H. Harold Hume, President, (Nurseryman. Representing the Rose Stock Growers.)
Glen Saint Mary, Fla.

John Fraser, Jr., (Nurseryman)
Huntsville, Ala.

The Garden Club of America,
Mrs. F. E. Crowninshield,
164 Marlboro St.,
Boston, Mass.

Garden Magazine, (Horticultural Press and Amateur)
Leonard Barron, Editor,
Garden City, N.Y.

General Bulb Co.,
Wm. J. Van Waghendonk, Gen. Mgr. and Agent for U.S.A.,
Voglensang, Holland, and New York.

B. L. Gibbs & Son Co., (Growers of plants and cut flowers.)
B. L. Gibbs,
Cumberland, Md.

Thos. J. Grey Co.,
Peter M. Miller, Sec.,
Boston, Mass.

D. G. Griewortzer,
Alexandria, Va.

W. J. Guille, (Importer)
1035 - 73d St.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

A. Henderson, (Importer)
166 No. Wabash Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

Henry & Lee, (Bulb Importers),
Frank H. Henry,
97 Water St., New York, N.Y.

The E. G. Hill Co., (Rose growers.)
E. G. Hill,
Richmond, Ind.

D. Hill Nursery Co., (Member, American Association of Nurserymen.)
V. D. Hill, Vice-President,
Dundee, Ill.

Tuesday Club Sociological Society.
R. Ewald Klotz, President, [illegible] "Conducting the Home Club Social Hour," Jan.

Yale Review, 27:, (December)
Bibliography, etc.

The Women Club of Boston.
Mrs. W. L. Chenhalls.
Its Beginnings Inc.
Boston, Mass.

Women Magazine, (Development from an Club)
Leonard Barron, editor.
Boston City, U.S.

Woman's Club Div.
Mrs. A. Mc. Fadyen (Mrs. Jno. Paul (or Talia.)
"Reference, Pictures, etc." Mar. Elec.

E. L. Flynn & Bur Co., (Division of Flynn and Bur Electric)
E. L. Flynn.
Cambridge, Ma.

Geo. C. Gray Co.,
Henry M. Gilles, Gen.
Boston, Mass.

G. L. Gleason,
Lexington, Ma.

C. W. Gallie. (Inventor)
Lynn - Mass Co.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

A. Hamilton. (Inventor)
Lake St. Tobacco Co.,
Chicago, Ill.

Harp & Law. (Lady Inventor)
Frank E. Harp,
37 Water St., Bos Ston, Ma.

Ida C. H. Hill Co., (Home Inventor)
E. V. Hill,
Elmhurst, Ill.

L. Hill Brewer Co., Inventor, Manufacturing of Chocolate,
V. A. Hill, President.
Boston, Ill.

W. T. Hood & Co., (Growers & Dealers of Nursery Stock)
W. T. Hood,
Richmond, Va.

Hoopes Bros. & Thomas Co., (Nurserymen. American Assn. of Nurserymen.)
Wilmer W. Hoopes,
West Chester, Pa.

Committee of Horticultural Quarantine,
J. Horace McFarland, Chairman,
Harrisburg, Pa.
E. L. D. Seymour, Secretary, 598 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.
(Amateur and scientific grower.)

House & Garden Magazine, (Horticultural Press and Amateur)
Joseph J. Love, Mgr., Garden Dept.,
19 West 44th St., New York City.
Richardson Wright, Editor.

Illinois State Nurserymen's Association, Nurserymen's Group,
J. A. Young, Sec.,
Aurora, Ill.

Jackson & Perkins Co., (American Nurserymen)
C. H. Perkins, Vice President,
Newark, N.Y.

Andrew R. Kennedy, (Seeds - bulbs)
226 W. 34th St.,
New York, N.Y.

Robert Kife, (Representing the American Florist, Chicago, Ill)
Philadelphia, Pa.

C. B. Knickman, (Importers & Member of Society of American Florists)
95 Chambers St.,
New York, N.Y.

Knox County Nurseryman & Fruit Grower,
W. C. Reed, Member of Executive Committee, American Assn. of Nurserymen.)
Vincennes, Ind.

Koster Co., (Nurserymen)
P. M. Koster,
Bridgeton, N.J.

H. Langeler, (Member Society American Florists.)
61 - 4th St.,
New Dorp, L.I., N.Y.

Clarence F. Lea,
Santa Rosa, Calif.

Wm. G. Lehr,
Brooklyn, Md.

C. U. Liggit, (Plant, Bulb & Seed Broker.)
505 Bulletin Bldg.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Van Lindley Nursery Co., (Nurserymen)
Paul C. Lindley,
Pomona, N.C.

La Park Seed and Plant Co.,
La Park, Pa.

Thos. A. McBeth, (Nursery Florist)
Springfield, O.

Massachusetts Horticultural Society,
Albert C. Burrage, President,
Boston, Mass.

The Merchants Association of New York,
W. H. Mahoney,
New York, N.Y.

Henry F. Michell, (Seeds - Plants - Bulbs)
518 Market St.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Wm. H. Moon Co., (Nurserymen)
J. Edward Moon, Secretary,
Morrisville, Pa.

National Bulb Farms, Inc., (Commercial Grower)
A. M. Grootenderst, Mgr.,
Benton Harbor, Mich.

National Canners' Association,
C. G. Woodbury, Director, Bu. of Raw Products Research,
Washington, D. C.

The Netherlands Chamber of Commerce in New York, Inc.,
L. Wittert van Hoogland, Secretary.

National Garden Bureau,
J. H. Burdett,
Room 1506, 431 S. Dearborn St.,
Chicago, Ill.

North East Seedmen's Association,
Peter M. Miller, Secretary,
16 S. Market St., Boston, Mass.

New York & New Jersey Association of Plant Growers,
William H. Siebrecht, Jr.,
179 Hunter Ave., Long Island City, N.Y.

Charles Nieman, (Importer, Seeds & Bulbs)
261 Broadway,
New York, N.Y.

Philadelphia Florist Club,
Alfred M. Campbell, President, (Florist)
Strafford, Pa.

A. N. Pierson, Inc.,
Wallace R. Pierson, Secretary & Asst. Treasurer, (Florist & Nurseryman.
Cromwell, Conn. Director of the Society of Am. Florists)

William Pitkin, (Nurseryman)
Rochester, N.Y.

Robert Pyle, (Nurseryman)
West Grove, Pa.

Rice Brothers Co., (Nurserymen)
John P. Rice, President,
Geneva, N.Y.

Rynveld Bros., (Importers)
A. Rynveld, Lisse,
1123 Broadway, New York, N.Y. Holland.

Chas. Schwake & Co., Inc. (Importers & Exporters, Horticultural Plants,
Chas. Schwake, President, Bulbs, Etc.)
149 Church St., New York, N.Y.

Sherman Nursery Co., (American Nurserymen's Assn.)
E. C. Patten,
Charles City, Iowa.

Henry B. Siebrecht, (Florist. Member, Society of American Florists,
Broadway & 2d Ave., New York Florists Club.)
New York, N.Y.

Charles Siegwart,
23 Siegwart Lane, P.O.Sta. D.,
Baltimore, Md.

S. S. Skidelsky & Co., (Importers & Member of Society of Am. Florists.)
S. H. Skidell,
53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

John Kingdon Smith,
Hotel La Salle,
Chicago, Ill.

Jacob D. Spiegel, (Gladiolus grower)
Norma, N.J.

Spring Wheat Crop Improvement Assn., Board of Trade,
Bert Ball,
Chicago, Ill.

Stump & Walker Co., (Seedsmen, Importers & Growers of Seeds and Bulbs.)
William A. Sperling, Sec.,
30 Barclay St., New York, N.Y.

Charles H. Totty. (Florist)
Madison, N.J.

A. J. Van der Vies & Co.,
I. W. Steelman, (Grower of Roses and Lilacs & Evergreens)
Mrs. A. J. Van der Vies, Member of the firm, (Grower of roses & lilacs.)
Oakton, Va.

Vaughan's Seed Store,
J. C. Vaughan, Pres.,
Chicago and New York Growers, Dealers & Importers.

Verhalen Nursery Co., (Nurserymen)
Geo. F. Verhalen,
Scottsville, Tex.

Ralph M. Ward & Co., Inc., (Importers)
25 Murray St.,
New York, N.Y.

Washington Nursery Co., (Nurserymen)
A. McGill,
Toppenish, Wash.

John Watson,
Princeton, N.J.

Yokohama Nursery Co., (Importers, Florist)
C. W. Scott,
233 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

Thomas Young, (Orchid Growers & Raisers)
W. J. Jones,
Bound Brook, N.J.

Charles Pynaert, Delegate of Belgian Government,
President, Chambre Syndicate du Horticulteur Belge,
1 Rue de Florence, Brussels.

Louis Sander, Delegate a Belgium
Sander & Fils, Horticulteurs,
Bruges.

F. de Selys, (Representing the Embassy)
Counselor of the Belgian Embassy.

W. G. Lobjoit, (Representing Great Britain)
Controller of Horticulture,
London, England.

Jacques Courtine,
Ollioules,
France.

Bulb Growers & Exporters Syndicate.
Toulon,
France.

H. J. Arentshorst, Holland Bulb Growers Assn.
Sassenheim,
Holland.

P. de Wreede with
J. Onderwater & Co., Bulb Growers,
Lisse, Holland.

G. C. Eldering,
Overveen,
Holland.

Legers Bros., Ltd., (Importers)
J. H. Rau,
Lisse, Holland.

John Radder,
Holland.

C. J. Speelman, (Dutch Bulb Exporters Assn.)
Sassenheim,
Holland.

Geo. Teyebour,
Lisse,
Holland.

H. van Poeteren,
Chief Phytopathological Service,
Holland.

Dr. E. van Slogteren,
Netherlands State, Phytopathologist for the Bulb District,
Holland.

G. A. Van Zanten, Exporter,
Van Zanten & Co.,
Hillegom, Holland.

W. E. Britton,
State Entomologist, Agricultural Experiment Station,
New Haven, Conn.

W. S. Brock,
Sec., Illinois State Horticultural Society,
University of Illinois,
Urbana, Ill.

E. W. Cole,
State Department of Agriculture,
Austin, Tex.

Ernest N. Cory,
State Entomologist,
College Park, Md.

J. M. Del Curto,
Plant Pathologist,
Austin, Tex.

G. F. Gravatt,
State Horticulturist,
Auburn, Ala.

J. H. Montgomery,
Plant Quarantine Inspector,
Gainesville, Fla.

O. T. Olsen,
Div. of Pl. Ind.,
Dept. of Agri.
Springfield
Ill.

W. L. Neese,
Sec. & Treas., Georgia State Board of Entomology,
Atlanta, Ga.

J. G. Sanders, (Representing also the Am. Assn. of Economic Entomologists)
Director, Bureau of Plant Industry,
Harrisburg, Pa.

G. C. Starcher,
State Horticulturist,
Auburn, Ala.

L. R. Taft,
State Inspector of Nurseries and Orchards,
Lansing, Mich.

Ralph H. Taylor, (Also Representing Calif. Almond Growers Exchange.)
Representing Calif. State Dept. of Agriculture,
Sacramento, Calif.

C. E. Temple,
State Plant Pathologist,
College Park, Md.

Harry B. Weiss,
Chief, Bu. Statistics & Inspection, N.J. Dept. of Agriculture,
Trenton, N.J.

E. A. White,
Prof. of Horticulture, Cornell University,
Ithaca, N.Y.

J. M. R. Adams,
Federal Horticultural Board.

C. R. Ball,
Cerealist,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

R. Kent Beattie,
Federal Horticult ral Board.

Nathan Augustus Cobb,
Office of Agriculture Technology,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

L. C. Corbett,
Horticulturist,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

O. F. Cook,,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

O. M. Courtney,
Federal Horticultural Board.

P. H. Dorsett,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

H. R. Fulton,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

W. W. Gilbert,
Plant Pathologist,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

H. P. Gould,
Pomologist,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

R. J. Haskell,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

George G. Hedgcock,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

Thomas H. Kearney,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

David Lumsden,
Federal Horticultural Board.

J. F. Martin,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

Eugene May, Jr.,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

F. L. Mulford,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

L. B. Scott,
U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Harry B. Shaw,
Federal Horticultural Board.

C. L. Shear,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

John A. Stevenson,
Federal Horticultural Board.

Walter T. Swingle,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

William A. Taylor,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

M. B. Waite,
Bureau of Plant Industry.

Guy E. Yerkes,
United States Department of Agriculture.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Office of the Secretary
Press Service

Release - Immediate.

March 11, 1922.

PLANT QUARANTINE CONFERENCE AGAIN POSTPONED.

The conference on plant quarantine, originally called to meet here March 15 and postponed, at the request of the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists, to April 19, has been again postponed until May 15. The second postponement is made at the request of the President of the American Association of Nurserymen, who represents that the month of April is the one season of the year when the nurseryman must be on his job to get out his orders and do his planting. The new date has been referred to the President of the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists, and has been approved by him.

//

643-22

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD
Washington, D. C.

PLANT QUARANTINE CONFERENCE

Recent correspondence indicates that the call for a conference April 19, 1922, to discuss the classes of plants to be admitted under the limitations established in Regulation 3 of Quarantine 37, is not clearly understood.

Since the establishment of Quarantine 37, the classes of plants included under Regulation 3 have been criticised as either including too much or not enough; in other words, the criticisms have been of such contradictory character as not to warrant making any changes in the operation of the quarantine.

The Board has, however, repeatedly announced that it was ready at any time to confer with propagators and also importers to consider any additions to the classes of plants included under Regulation 3 which could be shown to be justified and reasonably safe. The Board has given hearings also to two foreign delegations; one from Belgium last May and the other from Holland last June, and promised them that a conference on the general subject of Regulation 3 would be held some time during the present year. The call for the conference recently issued is, therefore, in response to individual requests and carries out the promise to these foreign delegates.

As representing another phase of the subject, during the past season the infestation of fruit and rose stocks has been unusually heavy with larval nests of the brown-tail moth and also with similar but much smaller larval nests of an insect new to the United States which might very possibly prove to be a serious enemy to the horticulture of this country. In spite of repeated warnings to European shippers, the condition in this respect of imported stocks does not appear to be improving and it becomes necessary to consider what further steps should be taken to protect the country from the entry of these and other pests in connection with the importation of such stocks.

The Board does not feel that at the present time it has sufficient information to warrant making any changes in the classes of plants included in Regulation 3, but hopes to secure from this conference information that will clearly justify action on one or more of the following propositions: (1) the continuation of the classes now in Regulation 3, (2) the need, if any, for restricting the classes of plants now included in this regulation, and (3) the need, if any, of adding to the classes of bulbs or plants under this regulation.

Except as outlined above, the Board has no program, drastic or otherwise, of changes in Regulation 3 in mind, and has merely opened the subject, in response to requests, for free and full discussion. There is no thought of weakening in any material way the protection which the quarantine now gives, but it is possible that some minor amendments can be made without risk.

C. L. MARLATT,
Chairman, Federal Horticultural Board.

March 2, 1922.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Office of the Secretary
Press Service

Release - Immediate.

PLANT QUARANTINE HEARING POSTPONED.

- - -

Washington, D. C., February 17, 1922. The conference on plant quarantine called to meet here March 15 has been postponed until April 19, the Federal Horticultural Board, United States Department of Agriculture, announced to-day. The first date, it was found, conflicted with important national and international flower shows scheduled for the latter part of March, thus preventing many florists and horticulturists from attending.

The conference will meet at the offices of the board here, at 10 o'clock, April 19, for the purpose of considering the advisability of any modifications--additions to or deductions from--of the classes of plants permitted entry under permit for immediate sale under Regulation 3 of Quarantine 37. Opportunity will be afforded for full and free discussion of the whole subject of the classes of plants involved and the restrictions enforced under this regulation.

###

607-22

17-22-2

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Office of the Secretary
Press Service

Release- Immediate.

CONFERENCE ON PLANT QUARANTINE

A conference is called by the Federal Horticultural Board at the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., March 15, 1922, at 10 o'clock a. m., for the purpose of considering the advisability of any modifications--additions to or deductions from--of the classes of plants permitted entry under permit for immediate sale under Regulation 3 of Quarantine 37. Such conference will afford opportunity for a full and free discussion of the whole subject of the classes of plants involved and the restrictions enforced under this regulation.

Regulation 3 now provides for the entry of certain classes of bulbs, representing 80 to 90 per cent of the importations into the United States prior to the quarantine, and also of stocks, cuttings, and scions of fruit, rose stocks, and seeds of fruit, forest, ornamental and shade trees and hardy shrubs. The purpose of the conference, therefore, is to consider the desirability of any restrictions in this list of plants or additions to it. Under this regulation open continuing permits are issued for the plants listed. In other words, there is no limitation on the number of plants which may be imported under such permits.

PLANT QUARANTINE CONFERENCE - MAY 15, 1922.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: Very shortly after I became connected with the Department of Agriculture, I began to hear about Quarantine 37, and I have heard of it at not infrequent intervals since. This conference is called for the purpose of discussing that quarantine. It was called originally for March, but postponed to meet the convenience of some of the gentlemen who wished to be present, and was postponed again to meet the convenience of others. We have invited you to come here in order that you might have an opportunity to fully express your views concerning this point. When the conference has concluded its business we do not want any one to be able to say that the views of any of those which might properly be expressed have not been expressed. I have asked three gentlemen to sit during the conference in the capacity of an Advisory Committee, - Dr. Whitten, Professor of Horticulture, of the University of California; President A. F. Woods, of the Maryland Agricultural College, and President R.A.Cochman of the American Nursery Association. I have asked ~~you~~ these gentlemen to come to listen to the discussions and consider everything from every side and then make a report to me. Naturally in a gathering of this sort, if we are to get ahead without unnecessary waste of time there must be some orderly method of discussion. I have assumed that three or four groups are represented here, and that probably it will be satisfactory to the

members of these different groups if they themselves select someone who might act as spokesman in a general way for the group, this without a view of preventing any one from appearing. Cards will be handed you, blank cards such a s I hold in my hand, upon which I am asking you to write your name, your address, and the group or society to which you belong, and your title if you are engaged in any official work. I think that the groups might be about as follows: First the State officials, (if there are any such here), the nurserymen, the florists, the amateurs, and the importers or brokers.

MR. MC FARLAND: In that grouping I do not notice any place for the great educational gardens of the country, the New York Society, and our own amateur institutions that are here represented.

THE SECRETARY: I had in mind grouping those as coming under the heading of official groups. This grouping is not arbitrary in any sense. If there are any suggestions please be free to make them. We have also the pleasure of having with us delegations from three other nations, - Holland, Belgium and Great Britain, and before the Conference concludes, I hope we shall have an opportunity to hear briefly from these visiting brethren. We will ask Dr. Marlatt, the Chairman of the Federal Horticultural Board, to discuss the matter in a general way to ~~lead~~ carry out the work. Then we will adjourn to give you an opportunity to get together in groups and beginning this afternoon, hear from the representatives of the various groups.

DR. MARLATT: Mr. Secretary, Ladies and Gentlemen: There has already been distributed a statement which has been drawn up for your information covering the general subject of the conference this morning. Everything that I have to say, or nearly everything perhaps I have put into that statement, and it has been indexed on the title page so that you can look at the topics and get the information at your leisure or at your wish. It seems, however, desirable to make as briefly as I can a general statement covering the matter so as to put the subject before you and to perhaps give some direction and point to the discussion. The Secretary has already stated that this is a conference; it is not a formal hearing conducted by the Federal Horticultural Board; it is a conference ~~in~~ of the Department of Agriculture with all the interests and persons who are affected by Quarantine 37. It is not preliminary to action, drastic or otherwise; it is simply to get information. I think I should say frankly that the Department has no thought that Quarantine 37 should be weakened or abolished. The Department feels absolutely convinced, as I think the country as a whole does, if I can read the feeling throughout the country, that protection against the entry of plant pests is an absolute necessity. It becomes the emergency a matter of consideration of changes in detail which can be made without interfering with the general policy or ~~technical~~ principle of the quarantine. If there are any items which can be added to free entry

MR. MAGNUTT: Mr. Secretary, ladies and gentlemen: There has already been distributed a statement which has been drawn up for your information covering the general subject of the conference this morning, everything that I say, or nearly everything perhaps I have put into that statement, and it has been indexed on the title page so that you can look at this topics and get the information at your leisure or at your will. It seems, however, desirable to make as briefly as I can a general statement covering the matter so as to put the subject before you and to perhaps give some direction and point to the discussion. The Secretary has already stated that this is a conference; it is not a formal [illegible] by the [illegible] [illegible]; it is a conference in the Department of Criminal Law with all the interested persons who are affected by immigration [illegible]. It is not preliminary to action, [illegible] or otherwise; it is simply to get information. I think I should say frankly that the Department has no thought that [illegible] should be weakened or abolished. The Department feels [illegible] convinced, as I think the country as a whole does, if I [illegible] feeling throughout the country, that protection against [illegible] immigrants is an absolute necessity. It becomes a [illegible] [illegible] can be made without [illegible] principle of the [illegible]

now is the time to discuss these items and make constructive suggestions. If there are any items under free entry at the present time which in the near future or the distant future, not too distant, may be taken away from free entry now is the time to discuss it. What we want, however, is information, constructive suggestions, and we want criticism. I stated at the meeting of the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists in Detroit in 1919 that the Board welcomes criticism; that it would feel just as friendly toward the man who criticised it as ~~they are~~ toward any other man, and that he could come to the Board after such criticism and get the same treatment as any other man. I do not know but what I made a mistake as large advantage has been taken of that offer. (LAUGHTER).

Now, the point we want you to consider first is the general principle of Quarantine 37. It is given in this document. I do not know that I will state it quite as well as it is there, but the principle is that any plant importation is subject or leaves the way open for a certain risk of entry of pests, and most of the pests of the country that have come in from foreign lands have come in with plant importation. If you are to keep these pests out of the country there is only one way to do it efficiently, and that is to reduce importation. Inspection and certification have been tried out, and have not been as successful as we would like. The principle then, under quarantine 37, is to restrict importation to the necessities, but to permit importation of things that are necessary. That is all based on this matter

of risk. I hardly need to give illustrations, but any trivial importation may bring in a serious pest. It so happened that some of the worst pests of the country have come in on absolutely trivial importations, importations which were unnecessary to the horticulture of the country or the forestry or agriculture. A very small importation of Japanese iris brought in the Japanese beetle which is going to be one of the great pests of the country. The San Jose scale was brought in on a shipment of Chinese flowering peaches sent over by a missionary some fifty years ago. It has cost the country on an average of ten million dollars a year in control work, counting the damage as nothing. The brown-tail moth came in on a shipment of roses from Holland or France; the gipsy moth was brought in by a French scientist—through the importation of blue spruce from Holland, as nursery stock, which is responsible for the tremendous invasion of New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania of this moth, was made by a shipment of blue spruce just prior to the enactment of the Quarantine Act. Congress has added to the appropriation for the Gipsy moth nearly double in an effort to control this pest in New Jersey. The appropriation for the gipsy moth, if I recollect right, amounts to something upwards of $600,000 to be spent annually. The pine blister rust which now threatens the pine forests of the whole country and has recently got foothold in Washington State was brought in on a shipment of the American white pine seedlings from Germany. The chestnut blight which has wiped out our chestnut forests was brough in on an importation of Oriental or flowering

chestnut trees. It started in Eastern New York or somewhere there, coming in on an importation of Japanese chestnuts, unwittingly, because we did not know the pest was there. During the four years that it took to get the Plant Quarantine Act through Congress, on account of opposition, no less than four important pests came in in that short period. I mention that to show the rapidity with which they care coming in.

Of these important pests listed on page 17 (the Oriental fruit worm is just beginning to wipe out production in large commercial orchards--it already has a foothold in several States), four--the Japanese beetle, citrus canker, potato wart, and European corn borer--all came in during that four-year period when we were trying to get legislation; one pest a year with a capacity of millions of dollars of damage.

I say this with some hesitation as to the future, but it is a fact that no important pest has come into this country and become established since the Plant Quarantine Act was established. That does not mean that a lot of pests are not already in which have not been discovered, but no important pest of first rank has come in and established itself since the Plant Quarantine Act was enacted by Congress. On the other hand, the number of interceptions which have been made of pests as a result of inspection is enormous. A statement has been put into your hands which gives you a little information on that subject. That is Circular No. 150 which has been distributed. I am not going into the subject as you can look it up for yourselves.

We now come to the point of the discussion of this morning, namely, Quarantine 37 and Regulation 3 thereunder. The question has been raised as to how wide open this discussion is to be. I wish to say that the doors are absolutely open for discussion of the quarantine in any fashion. Regulation 3 is the crux of the whole matter. It permits importation of plants in unlimited quantities which anyone may wish to import. There are no restrictions on permits or on the quantity. Five classes of plants and seeds are permitted entry. The conference is called to consider whether we shall add to the regulation or whether we shall deduct from the regulation and we will give consideration to any we can add, or you can recom-

mend anything you may wish to be taken from it. In other words, Regulation 3 is the crux of the whole matter and opens the whole subject for discussion.

Two other circulars have long since been distributed. We have copies here but I think most of you have them. One is Circular 105 which tells how you can bring in the so-called "prohibited" or really restricted plants, and the other is Circular 145 which gives a record of the importations which have been made of such plants.

The quarantine provides for the entry of every plant whatsoever. Two regulations provide for unlimited entry--Regulations 2 and 3. All the others come under Regulation 14, which provides for limited entry. The three regulations together cover all plants whatsoever for any horticultural or production purpose. Under Regulation 3 at the present time there are five items but really only three of special interest to you. The others relate to tree seeds and I don't think there is any discussion by the Department or anyone else about leaving that for the present--leaving the doors open for such importations.

The limitation on the three items of bulbs, fruit stocks, and rose stocks, I have discussed briefly in this circular which has been put in your hands. Fruit stocks are properly discussed, I think. You will remember that the nurserymen of the country joined with the Department of Agriculture some years ago in getting appropriations from Congress for the specific purpose of determining whether fruit stocks could be produced in this country. It was so stated in the language of the appropriation. That appropriation has been granted three times. Two years' work has been performed under it by the Bureau of Plant Industry. Therefore it is perfectly proper at this time to take a record of progress and find where we stand on the question of fruit stock importations, not with the idea that we are going

such duplicate you may wish to be taken from it. In other words, Regulation 3 is the core of the whole matter and opens the whole subject for discussion.

Two other circulars have long since been distributed. We have copies here—all I think most of you have them. One is Circular 219 which tells how you can bring in the so-called "prohibited" or weakly restricted plants, and the other is Circular 165 which gives a record of the importations which have been made of such plants.

The quarantine provides for the entry of stock plant propagation, the [illegible] [illegible] (with no [illegible] [illegible])—Regulations 4 and 5. All are taken care under Regulation 14, which provides for limited entry. The three regulations therefore cover all plants whatsoever for any horticultural or propagation purposes. Under Regulation 3 of the quarantine there are five items but really only three are of special interest to you. The others relate to tree seeds and I don't think there is any disposition by the Department or anyone else about lowering that for the present—leaving the doors open for such importations.

The limitation on the three items of bulbs, fruit stocks, and rose stocks, I have discussed briefly in this circular which has been put in your hands. Fruit stocks are properly discussed, I think. You will remember that the nurserymen of the country joined with the Department of Agriculture some years ago in getting an appropriation from Congress for the specific purpose of determining whether fruit stocks could be produced in this country. It was so stated in the language of the appropriation. That appropriation has been granted three times. Two years' time has been afforded under it by the Bureau of Plant Industry. Therefore it is perfectly proper at this time to take a record of progress and find where we stand on the question of fruit stock importations; and with the idea that we can grow

to cut them off next year or in the next five years, but to find out where we stand and get the ideas of the people who are interested and their recommendations and suggestions.

Rose stocks were put under this free list at the earnest recommendation of the rose growers in this country at the time of our hearing relative to Quarantine 37. I have been advised by a good many rose growers who are prominent in this country that that was a mistake--that they could be produced here after a very short period. We have not any policy or suggestions to make on rose stocks. It is an open question. We would like to have your advice.

Now as to other ornamentals--that means all things under Regulation 14 now restricted--that is also an open question. Anything you think should come under Regulation 3 and could so come without violating or endangering the general principle of the quarantine is open to discussion. In fact you have the whole subject open for discussion.

Now as to any changes, the Board's and Department's point of view relative to these changes has been expressed in a letter which I wrote to the Editor of the Florists' Exchange in response to an editorial or letter which he wrote. That is quoted in this document. I stated that the Department had nothing in mind at that time but should the Department call such a conference as this and if, as a result of such comference, it should be determined that any article under Regulation 3 should be restricted as to further entry, ample time would be given for any necessary readjustments, both with respect to the home and foreign growers of such plants. I meant by that one, two, four or five years; whatever time was necessary for the interests in this country to adjust themselves and sufficient time ~~to give~~ the interests abroad to adjust themselves. In other

We will have all your pages on file when that story, and to view and review those and you are aware of the people who are interested and their recommendations and suggestions.

Some weeks ago you asked Alice Dunn list of the member organizations of the food industry in this country at our request of our industry activity in connection with. I have been advised by a good many trade associations and companies that they would be prevented from making a report on the problem in this country because of the fear that they could be prosecuted under a very short period. We have not any policy or recommendation to make on this subject. I do not know anything. We would like to have your advice.

We are in other respectively--that means all things under Consultation in our activities--that is also on your question. According you also mention the regulation I was asked by some at least clinical or educational the question right of the production is when to discussion. In that you have the work report that you discussion.

Now as to my comment, the Board's and Department's point of view relative to that project has been expressed in a letter which I wrote to the Editor of the Farmer. Challenge in response to an editorial or letter which he wrote. This is quoted in this document. I stated that the Department had nothing in mind at that time and hence the Department will push a mandatory on this and it, as a result of such activeness, it should be strengthened that any strong water regulation I would be restricted as to further safety, which it would be given for any necessary qualification, but with respect to the home and family product of such plants. I would by that one, two, four or five years determine the necessary for the industry in this country to adjust themselves and sufficient time to give the industry efforts to adjust themselves. In other

words, we would not make snap judgment on our own people or on the foreigners who are producing the things we actually want and need. We hoped and intended to be absolutely fair. I hope you all read it. It indicates the policy and purpose of the Department if any changes should result from this conference. That covers the subject we have before us this morning.

Now, if I may have your permission for a few minutes, I would like to discuss very briefly one or two matters which should perhaps be brought out so you will understand them. I want to point out the real difficulty with Quarantine 37. The Board has promulgated 54 quarantines, but only 39 are now alive--39 quarantines. We do not hear anything of any of these 39 except No. 37. I presume that the Secretary of Agriculture hardly knows of the existence of the other 38. What is the difficulty with Quarantine 37? These other quarantines prohibit or restrict and they apply to every citizen of the United States alike. They apply to a definite ~~curb-on~~ group of plants or objects or articles of commerce. There is no variation in the application of the quarantines. Quarantine 37 is selective and that is where the whole difficulty comes in. It selects first the plants that are open to free entry under Regulations 3 and 2, and [illegible] It selects the plants which are open to restricted entry under Regulation 14; and under Regulation 14, again, it selects the varieties which should come in. We make selections in the matter of permittees on the basis of public service and that public service may be of the nature of making plants available. We issue permits to all commercial concerns who will bring in plants and hold them for a number of years under bond to multiply them and make them available to all the people. We give permits to all public institutions, experimental stations, agricultural gardens, botanical gardens, and arboretums. We give them to a limited class of amateurs. That will be discussed

later although I might take it up now. The giving of permits to amateurs is also based on the selective feature. All these selective features must be a matter of judgment. Somebody has got to select. No two groups of people will agree. The law of Congress provides that the Act shall be enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary has in his Department probably the largest group of plant men in the country--in the world--representing every phase of horticulture, agriculture and forestry. It would seem reasonable that the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture, therefore, should be the place and the institution and the authority for such selection. If we left the selection to a group of nurserymen--of course that would be impossible--we might as well turn over the establishment of the liquor control to the brewers or whisky manufacturers, or we might as well turn over the collection of the customs to the importers. You have got to have the authority somewhere. It is properly in the Department of Agriculture.

Later although I cannot tell in my own. The giving of gifts is a tendency in man and also in the animals domain. All their activities involve more or a means of pleasure. Somebody has yet to be which. In the people of people will arise. The law of [illegible] plant the act shall be accepted by the [illegible] of [illegible] and the [illegible] has to fill important probably the largest group of plant and in the country--in the world--particularly every place of [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible]. It would even [illegible] that the [illegible] and the [illegible] of [illegible], therefore, should be the place and the [illegible] the [illegible] for such [illegible]. If we talk the [illegible] to a group of [illegible]--of course that would be [illegible]--we might as well [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] contend to the [illegible] or [illegible], or the [illegible] as well [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] in the [illegible]. The [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible]. It is [illegible] in the [illegible] of [illegible].

~~DR. MARLATT~~: The Federal Horticultural Board is simply an advisory body to the Secretary, provided for in the Plant Quarantine Act, but it is the Department of Agriculture that acts. There has not been a permit issued by the Board. The permits are issued by the Secretary in point of fact, but everyone of these permits have passed through the Bureau of Plant Industry; they have been examined and approved by that Bureau, ~~for~~ the restricts some or selects some. In other words, ~~that~~ is not ~~all~~ done by the Board, but is done by the experts of the Department as a whole, the best experts ~~in~~ the Department ~~have~~ have now to take up the question of restrictions as to amateurs, and that perhaps is the real important matter that is up for discussion this morning. I hope it is, and the people who are [illegible] the amateur have my ~~serious~~ hearty sympathy; I would like to do for the amateur~~;~~ the Department would like to do for the amateur plant lover of the country ~~-~~ everything that these people would have us ~~to~~ do. The difficulty, however, is in the administration. There are amateurs in every town and village and hamlet of the United States; thank God, lots of them, who are interested in flowers and plants, and who would be delighted if they could ~~do so, to~~ import directly from Holland and Belgium and France and England, but what would be the result of that permission. It would simply mean that the importations through amateurs would be multiplied to ten thousand or a hundred thousand individuals; these plants would have to go to every town and hamlet in the United States; they would have to go under conditions where they could be grown and propagated by these

amateurs, and it would mean a volume of work that the Department and the country could not possibly take care of. It would mean a risk many times greater than before Quarantine 37 was established when under the old system the importations came in rather large bulk, chiefly through the big importers and ~~a~~ the number of amateurs who made importations, as our records show. ~~That~~ It would be worse than before; it would give opportunity for every pest to get to every corner ~~of the land in~~ the United States. ~~It is simply~~ The impracticability of this ~~which makes us give you this~~ course is discuss~~ion~~ed in this document and I hope you will read it. But we recognize that there are in this country amateurs of high standing who are doing a public service, a good many of them who are doing a public service in maintaining special collections of plants which in a sense become small botanical gardens for their communities and their States. Many of these have nation-wide, world-wide reputations. There are other amateurs who are engaged in scientific and technical work with plants; they are doing breeding ~~where~~ work, they are producing new plants and they need original stock from abroad and all the new things that are developed abroad for their special technical work. The Board recognizes ~~this~~ the class of amateurs ~~who~~ are engaged in work which is a public service. All these men are doing a public service and as soon as these men apply and their credentials are passed on, not by the Board, but by the Bureau of Plant Industry and the experts of that Bureau, they are granted ~~these~~ permits. I

do not know the number which have been so granted, but there are a good many, three or four every week. The ordinary plant lover, however, is not as a rule doing any real public service. He gets the plant to grow in his own grounds; he is a wealthy man and he wants to get all these plants, full-grown to plant at once in his ground, or he may be a poor man and get a few plants, and he feels a certain pride in that he bought them directly from Holland; there is a certain pride in that, and we appreciate it, but it means that the circulation of these plants would be country-wide and would be beyond any possible control. It is stated much better in the document.

Now, we try to take care of these men who are excluded, and their pleadings have been heard, perhaps, in many cases, by making provision for them to secure any plants they want. These provisions are four: (1) there are all the plants that the big commercial men will import and they are numerous and they represent a number of varieties which is almost appalling. For instance the number of varieties of new roses run up to some 1,500 new varieties, and there are only a little over five or six hundred that have been developed in the United States since the time of Columbus. (2) All the plants that the commercial importer will probably need will ultimately be available for the amateur. (3) All the importations that all the public institutions may bring in, - the Agricultural colleges and Experiment Stations, and botanic gardens, all the institutions of that kind

do not know the number which have been so created, but there are a good many, three or four every week. The ordinary plant lover, however, is [illegible] directly from Holland. There is a certain [illegible], and we appreciate [illegible] of these plants would be country-wide and would be beyond any possible [illegible]. It is stated much better in the document.

Now, we try to take care of these men who are so afraid, and their [illegible] have been heard, [illegible] cases, by making provision for them to secure any plants they want. These provisions are four: (1) there are all the plants that the big commercial men will import and they are [illegible] a number of varieties which is almost appalling. For instance the number of varieties of new [illegible] was up to some 1,500 new varieties, and there are only a little [illegible] that have been developed in the United States [illegible]. All the plants that the commercial [illegible] ultimately be available for the [illegible] that all the public institu- [illegible] cultural colleges and Experiment [illegible], all the institutions of that kind

are given a free opportunity to import what they want and they do not have to give bond either; (3) all the importations which are permitted ~~to those~~ by these recognized amateurs is the third avenue of entrance; and the Fourth are importations by the Department of Agriculture. And, we have announced that if any amateur is not able to get the variety that he wants in the future through the first three ~~all of these~~ agencies, and will notify the Department we will see that he gets them through the Department of Agriculture on a showing or real need or necessity. Now, those provisions have been made for the entry of those so-called prohibited or really restricted plants. The question has risen ~~and~~ in a good deal of ~~this~~ the correspondence as to the board's and the Department's restrictions on new varieties. Now, let me say, again, that these restrictions and these determinations are made by these four or five men who represent the Board; they are made by the botanical and horticultural and other experts of the Department. Now, the Board has been liberal. Of course, this is a matter of growth. We have not accomplished this the first day, but it is a matter of growth. Things are added to the quarantine and things are simplified ~~and~~ or made more difficult from time to time both ways as the need develops. We first began bynallowing anyone to bring in anything that he claimed was a new variety. We discovered very shortly that that was a very wide-open door; that it was used as a means of fraud,—

old plants were given new varietal names, and were brought in, so we had to make some restrictions. We said any new variety which has been recognized in an important horticultural journal abroad or in this country as such could be imported. That was complained of, and then we added to that ~~they~~ the importation should be accompanied by ~~the~~ statement of the producer that the variety was new, giving its parentage if he could and such information concerning it as he would publish in a horticultural journal or florist journal if he were exploiting it as a new variety. Then, that was not quite enough. ~~among~~ importers, ~~Some~~ men whom we recognized as men of the highest standing in their field of industry, both flowers and plants, stated that they very often had occasion to import plants that had not been published; ~~they~~ had ~~first~~ just been created by hybridizing or other methods and they would get them on their trips abroad and that sort of thing, or they would send to them and ask a man to send in a list of the best new varieties that he had made the year previous, and we said "You can bring those in too if you will bring along with them just this information that you would naturally give if you were going to publish to exploit ~~them in a~~ that variety." In other words some little check against fraud. We are very sorry that we have had to check against fraud, which does not mean that we feel that the florists

and horticultural and commercial interests of the country are any better or any worse than other classes of people, but unfortunately there is always a small element in any group of men, in any class of society that cannot be trusted, and we have been forced into a good many of these restrictions which are now complained of simply as the only means of preventing fraud. The bond, these resitrictions or discriminations of new varieties all have been occasioned by repeated attempts at fraud, some of them very successful. On page 17 I have discussed the method of promulgating quarantines so that you will see the general method. I think probably it is worth your while to note on pages 17 and 18 the various steps that are normally followed in promulgating a quarantine. You will find there that there are eight steps involved ~~--normally~~ ten, -- that there are eight steps normally in such action. First, is the determination of the cause for the quarantine, the reason for it. Then we have a preliminary conference among the experts of the Department, and anyone else that we can bring in,--very often the pest is reported by experts of other States, --to determine whether it is necessary to consider quarantine at all or not, That is rather necessary. Then we have very often, if it affects commercial interests in a large sense, the call for a preliminary open conference, because often we want to have a conference on this matter prior to having a formal hearing, more fully to determine whether quarantine is necessary. Then comes the formal notification of hearing so every body is advised. That is the normal and usual course followed.

and agricultural and commercial interests of the country are any better or any worse than other classes of people, but unfortunately there is always a small element in any group of men, in any class of society that cannot be trusted, and we have been forced into a good many of these restrictions which are now considered of simply as the only means of preventing fraud. The bond, these restrictions or discriminations of our varieties all have been occasioned by repeated attempts at fraud, some of them very successful. On page 17 I have discussed the method of promulgating quarantines so that you will see the general method. I think probably it is worth your while to note on pages 17 and 18 the various steps that are normally followed in promulgating a quarantine. You will find there that there are [illegible] involved --[illegible]ly, [illegible] -- that there are eight steps normally in each action. First, is the determination of the cause for the quarantine, the reason for it. Then we have a preliminary conference among the experts of the department, and suppose also that we can bring in,--very often the pest is reported by experts of other States, --to determine whether it is necessary to consider quarantine at all or not, that is rather necessary. Then we have very often, if it affects commercial interests in a large sense, the call for a preliminary open conference, because often we want to have a conference on this matter prior to having a formal hearing, more fully to determine whether quarantine is necessary. Then comes the formal notification of hearing so every body is advised. That is the normal and usual course followed.

Now, in comparison with that, if you will turn to page 15 -- I think it is 15 -- you will find a record of the active steps followed in relation to Quarantine 37. ~~I have provided for this because more than ten steps were taken.~~

DR. MARLATT: The necessity for this quarantine was considered for a number of years by various National and State organizations. Resolutions came to the Department of Agriculture from these organizations. Finally, as a basis, after this two or three years' discussion in which the nurserymen and others were invited to participate at various times, the Department issued a notice of hearing on March 28, 1918. Two months later the hearing was conducted and largely attended. Following this hearing the Board, in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry, made a thoroughgoing country-wide investigation of the subject. Doctor Galloway and others traveled about the country and visited the big establishments to find out the details, how it would affect the industries, and how best the quarantine could be adjusted with the least injury and yet be of service. Following this period of investigation the quarantine and regulations were drafted but were not even submitted to the Solicitor or anyone else until they were sent to the newspapers and trade journals for publication and transmitted by letter to every person who attended the conference or manifested any interest in it, for examination prior to promulgation. When these came back to us, after an additional period of a month for examination, the quarantine finally was promulgated November 18, 1918, eight months after the original notice of hearing, and made effective some six months later. We went probably three or four times beyond what the law requires in the matter of notice of conference and hearings in regard to Quarantine 37. It would hardly seem justified, therefore, to represent that this quarantine came as an element of surprise to anyone who should have been interested.

The Federal Horticultural Board suffers under a bad name in various ways. It has been given a bad name by its enemies and the name designated in the Act itself is unfortunate. It is not in any particular sense a Horticultural Board. The Plant Quarantine Act covers every department of agriculture and forestry.

The society, the necessity for its preservation was mentioned for a number of years by various National and State organizations. Resolutions came to the attention of Congress from these organizations. Finally, on a basis, after hits and by three years' discussion in which the newspapers and others were invited to participate at various times, the Congressment issued a notice of hearing on March 26, 1928. The results later the hearing was conducted and largely attended. Following this hearing the Board, in cooperation with the Bureau of Plant Industry, made a thoroughgoing country-wide investigation of the subject. Doctor Galloway and others traveled about the country and visited the big growers. Literature to that end the totality, how it would affect the industries, and how best the committee could be adjusted with the least injury and yet be of service. Following this period of investigation the questions and regulations were secured but were not even submitted to the District or anyone else until they were sent to the newspapers and trade journals for publication and transmitted by letter to every person who attended the conference or manifested any interest in it, for consideration prior to promulgation. Then there was back to us, after an additional period of a month for consideration, the promulgation finally was promulgated November 16, 1928, eight months after the original notice of hearing, and such effective was six months later. The most probably there or four times before that when the law requires in the matter of notice of conference and hearings of hearing to determine it. It would hardly seem justified, therefore, to say that this promulgation came as an element of surprise to anyone who should have been informed.

The Federal Horticultural Board matter which a had been in various stages, it has been given a bad name in the country and the name designated in the act itself is unfortunate. It is not in any particular sense a horticultural [illegible] the Plant Quarantine Act deals also with insect-or-animal [illegible].

The Board's functions relate, therefore, to a vast number of subjects, horticulture being only one. In point of fact, as I pointed out, the expenditures of the Government under the direction of the Board through the Department are probably more than 90 per cent for subjects other than horticulture. The Board is an advisory body to the Secretary with respect to all quarantines on importations. Our quarantines cover the importation of cotton into the United States, which represents many hundred times greater value than plants, running up to three to five hundred million dollars worth of importations a year at times. It is necessary for the Board to control the use of this foreign cotton. It controls every cotton mill in the United States using foreign cotton. That means every important cotton mill in the United States--hundreds of them. It means drastic control of these mills, requiring large losses every year to the mills--burning parts of the cotton, such as picker waste. That looks like a large sum. It is simply one subject. The Secretary probably scarcely knows of that quarantine. These men have accepted it as for the benefit and for the protection of the country from one of the great cotton pests. We expend very large appropriations for the extermination of pests. For the control of the pink bollworm we receive approximately $600,000 annually. Then there are the European corn borer, gipsy moth and brown-tail moth, Japanese beetle, etc. Some are related to horticulture and some are not. Wheat and corn diseases, potato diseases, etc.--they all require quarantine restrictions to prevent their entry and movement in the United States. The Board covers a large field of which horticulture is only one item. The Board's name should be "Plant Quarantine Board" being properly the more expressive of its real function. The Board has, as a rule, worked in respect to all quarantines and the varied subjects covered thereby with special committees on these subjects. For instance, the cotton mill men had a committee of half a dozen men which met

The Board's conclusions mislead, therefore, to a very degree of emphasis, by stressing only one. In point of fact, as I pointed out, the expenditures of the government under the direction of the Board through the importers are probably more than 90 per cent for subsidies other than nominal ones. The Board is an advisory body to the Secretary with respect to all questions on importation. Our criticisms cover the importation of cotton into the United States, which importation reached three quarter million bales, amounting to be taken in fiscal 1933 twelve million dollars worth of importations duped at times. It is necessary for the Board to control the use of this foreign cotton. It controls every cotton mill in the United States using foreign cotton. That means every important cotton mill in the United States—hundreds of them. It means directly control of thousands, requiring large losses every year to the mills—leading parts of the cotton, such as plain weave. That looks like a large sum. It is slightly one eighth. The practicably probably necessary sums of that nature. Then one loss special it is to be benefited for the protection of the security from one of the cotton cotton parts. In addition large importations for the substitutions of parts. For the control of the Ghi mulers supplemental cotton, necessarily. Then there are the Dungaree cotton linen, clay mud and cross-bail cloth, Japanese Sarong, etc. Then are related to relationships and loss for cotton. That for crop diseases, yields diseases, etc.—they all require particular restrictions to prevent their being one increment in the United States. One Board covers a large field of total institutions is only one item. The Board's cases [illegible] "Milk provided the more expensive of its cost [illegible]. The Board has, or a [illegible], ended in [illegible] of [illegible] the [illegible] employees [illegible] from [illegible] commissions, or [illegible] the [illegible]. The [illegible] will [illegible] a [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]

with us half a dozen times and thrashed out the whole program of control. There were similar committees for practically each subject we discussed. There were plenty of committees representing horticulture and floriculture. There has never been a definite designation of such committee but the Department would have welcomed such a designation if the horticulturists, nurserymen and florists wished to establish a definite committee with the purpose of discussing with the Board any subject which came up that affected their interests. We would have been delighted. That would have been in addition to all these other matters of conference and consideration prior to action. That concludes what I have to say.

I wish to merely allude to one circular distributed here, and that is a brief statement of European restrictions on entry of American plants. I want to say we are not retaliating by this quarantine. They took their action for an entirely valid reason which we appreciated and never criticised. We took our action for an entirely valid and what we felt to be an entirely justified reason--the exclusion of pests. The action of both countries was purely internal action based on a need. That this action of ours, which was promptly opposed by the nurserymen and florists at the time, should become quite generally beneficial, is a matter for congratulation. It was not a part of the original plan. We are more glad that it should have been beneficial rather than injurious.

About these foreign laws, the Secretary has been advised this morning that Holland has rescinded her laws on the thought that by so doing similar action could be obtained from this country. That will be discussed later. I am sorry to have taken so much of your time. Thank you. (Applause)

No doubt there was retaliation from Holland and they [illegible] something about it.

with an half-a-dozen times was assured out the whole question of material. Their

were plotting against the particularly some surprise or disappointment. Their own

plenty of something supporting institutions and investments). Then one after

there a certain background of such something not the important world-wide

year's activities if the revolutionists, newspapers and individual island to be-

build a definite condition with the purpose of struggling with the local ag-

ainst which were up than affected their interests. We would have when utili-

ze. That world was been in activity to all these other matters of commerce and

industrialism gave it action. That reminders what I have to say.

I wish to merely allude to the circumstances surrounding here, not that it is brief

statement of Chinese investigations on behalf of American plants. I want to say we

are not responsible for this government. They have their action for an activity

with issues which we sympathized and merry criticized. We want our action for

an entirely full and good to this is to do activity political reason--for ex-

ploitation of price. The action of such measures was purely national action based

on a week. That this action of very, which was promptly opposed by the monarchies

and Chinese at the time, which brought into generally beneficial, is a matter

for congratulation. It was not a part of the original plan. We for know that

that it should have been unofficial been injurious.

Since these Pacific lands, the security has been strained with monetary and

Politics has reached our land on the Chinese that by a total change matters

which be obtained from this country. Our will be discussed later. I am only

to have taken up much of your time. Thank you. (Applause)

- - - - - -

THE SECRETARY: It is now ten minutes after eleven, and I think perhaps we can go forward about as well if we adjourn now and let the groups select their spokesmen and come together, say at one o'clock, prepared to hear from the various groups.

MR. VAUGHN: I would like to know how long this conference will continue. Many from outside have a question.

THE SECRETARY: That rests with you. Our thought is that we want an absolutely satisfactory expression of views here. We have no desire to keep you here longer than you wish to.

MR. VAUGHN: I would like to inquire if the protest filed with the Secretary will be turned over to the Board in the question you referred to, or whether it should be brought up verbally at this time.

THE SECRETARY: Any protests which have been filed will be considered in connection with the decision made.

MR. VAUGHN: By the Board.

THE SECRETARY: Yes.

MR. McFARLAND: Was it your intention a moment ago that questions would be asked of Dr. Marlatt at this time?

THE SECRETARY: If there are any questions you would like to ask at this time before making a presentation of your views? There are Mr. Secretary; I should like the Doctor

MR. McFARLAND: To tell us under what provision and section of the law the Secretary of Agriculture, in his view, is empowered to select ~~the~~ one amateur from another, or one horticultural institution from another,

or one firm from another for the importation of plants.

MR. VAUGHAN: I would like to ask if the Secretary will continue to preside at the conference because I think he should not hear one group without hearing the other group. Therefore, if the Secretary is not going to continue to preside one group might get in their position, and the other trade group would be barred out and have to speak before someone else.

THE SECRETARY: So far as my time will permit I expect to be here. (APPLAUSE). We are not able always to control our own time. I will say, however, that a complete transcript will be made of the proceedings here so that no one will suffer from lack of having his case presented when the whole matter is considered. Will you answer question now?

DR. MARLATT: I will make a very brief answer at this time. The authority is really given in Section 1 and in Section 7, and in Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5. Section one: "That it shall be unlawful for any person to import, or offer for entry in the United States any nursery stock unless and until a permit shall have been issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under such conditions and regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe." That is wide open, wide open.

MR. McFARLAND: I presume that the answer to the question is perfectly patent, is it in your mind a proper thing to discuss it, or to suggest any thing in connection with it.

THE SECRETARY: I am wondering whether that particular question might not better be taken up at ~~the~~ some other, smaller meeting. It is a question that ought not to be settled now, but we are quite willing to consider that matter.

MR. McFARLAND: I may say, Mr. Secretary, that the presentation I desire to make on behalf of the horticultural societies and the great educational institutions of the country and the amateurs has no bearing, or very little bearing on the legal relationship, and I have had reason to suppose since hearing a very capable discussion of the quarantine that we are really discussing a thing which is not according to the law, and I was asking the Doctor for that information. The impression is, I am willing to say, prevalent that the authority given by the Act of August 20, 1912 to establish a quarantine has been very largely exceeded, and that there has been forced upon the Secretary of Agriculture certain determinations which the report accompanying this Act when it was presented to Congress for passage did not even remotely imply, and I was desirous of getting this one question settled as many others. I agree with you that this is a question for a much smaller conference. I assume that every step that the Board has taken has been passed upon by its legal counsel. It is not the law; it is the lawyer's construction of what he thinks the law is. Now, there is a bare possibility that even a lawyer who serves the Government might make a mistake. In times past such a thing has happened, and in this ~~connection~~ it is believed that a very serious mistake has been made, and that not the Act, but that the application of Quarantine 37 is basicly illegal, and if that was the situation there would be no use of our sitting here because we would be discussing an academic question, a question which would be correct if the law was right, and I would like at this time to propose, Mr. Secretary that there be very soon that necessary legal study which

would convince you as the responsible authority under the government that the things done are legally done. I am very sure that no gentleman in the Federal Horticultural Board or anyone in the Department of Agriculture has the least desire to go an inch beyond the absolute letter and spirit of the law. Some of us who have read this law repeatedly and who have consulted counsel about it are under the impression that it was a law aimed ~~not~~ only at the exclusion of insects and diseases but that in some fashion it has come about that it is now becoming a law for the exclusion of plants and the result as we see it is unfortunate. ~~Now, Mr. Secretary, I have a very different presentation to make in respect to the application of this quarantine and that is why I made this statement because I desire very definitely to call into question the legality of quarantine 37.~~

I have a different presentation to make in respect to the application of this quarantine and that is why I make this statement because I desire to question the legality of Quarantine 37. I do not wish to be misunderstood. That is in no sense an opposition to the law which I think a very wise and good law, but a question as to whether its application has not very greatly exceeded the power conceded to it by Congress.

MR. PIERSON: I would like to supplement Mr. McFarland's statement. I want to say we are all in sympathy with the law, not only the letter but the spirit of it.

(reading from page 2 of statement issued by Dr. Marlatt): The general principle underlying Quarantine 37 is as rapidly as possible to make this country independent of foreign supplies with the object of ultimately reaching a condition where entry of foreign plants will be limited to new plants and to such plants as are not capable of production in the United States.

Dr. Marlatt said the Board was improperly named, that it should be called "Plant Quarantine Board." I think it should be called "Plant Tariff Board." Our position is this: We are thoroughly, as I said before, in favor of the law. We are in favor of a strict interpretation, but a great many of this group believe the burden is on the Government to prove the necessity for the quarantine, and not on the importers,--for a blanket order excluding everything because somewhere, sometime, some plant brought in some unknown disease. The act is explicit. Congress is very jealous of its perogatives. We challenge the administration of this quarantine. When Secretary Hughes was Governor of New York the matter of the quarantine came before him. I took it before him because at that time the burden was on the State to prove the necessity. The Governor was in accord with me. We are not alone. We are not here to say what can come in or can not. Our position is that every plant from anywhere at any time, whether we need it or not, should be excluded if it brings in injurious insects or diseases, and if it does not there is no authority to exclude it.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: I think, gentlemen, you will have to assume that the Department is acting within the law as we are advised by our counsel. Certainly we will get nowhere if we enter into a discussion of the legality of the Act at a conference of this sort. It is a very proper matter to be raised. There is no reason why those of you who feel we have exceeded the authority under the law should not raise the question at the proper time but at a conference of this kind I fear no progress can be made by discussing it.

MR. PIERSON: May I ask Doctor Marlatt to reply to my question?

DR. MARLATT: The same question was put by Mr. McFarland. The same answer would have to be made. The authority is given in Sections 1 to 7 of the Plant Quarantine Act. It is distributed through those seven sections. To take it up and discuss it in detail would take some time and it is hardly my place to do it perhaps. It is purely a legal matter. Every action of the Board and Department is passed upon by the Solicitor of the Department and we have that authority for the legality of our actions. If they have made a mistake that can be corrected. At the present time the quarantines--all of them--and the regulations--all of them--have been passed upon by the Solicitor of the Department to determine the question of authority under the Act and of legality, and if mistakes have been made it is a proper matter to be brought up either for conference on that particular subject or in the courts, but as the Secretary says, I don't see where we would accomplish anything by discussing it here.

MR. McFARLAND: I agree with Doctor Marlatt and with the statement of the gentleman who spoke before us. There is a very considerable question in the minds of many of us but we don't wish a useless discussion of it. May I indulge in a hope, however, of a conference which would look into the legal side of it, which would permit us laymen to meet with counsel with this Board, yourself, and the Solicitor? Any modifications hereafter suggested would be materially

influenced by this determination. May I have that hope?

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: Certainly.

Are any groups ready now to announce their spokesmen?

MR. McHUTCHISON: The florists have a case prepared which they would like to present at the proper time. We don't want to spring it on the meeting but would like to get it before the meeting as soon as we can.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: Give me the name of your spokesman.

MR. McHUTCHISON: This is the Tariff and Legislative Committee representing the Society of American Florists.

MR. McFARLAND: I will speak for the amateur interests and educational institutions. I speak in consequence of a conference called in New York some two years ago, participated in by some 45 National organizations without trade interest.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: Unless you have some other desire we will begin this afternoon hearing from you, followed by Mr. McHutchison, and in the meantime and before the meeting comes together this afternoon, will the other groups give me the names of the gentlemen they wish to speak for them?

The question was raised as to how long this conference would last, and I answered by saying "It depends on you." Is it your desire that the discussion should be limited? Should the time taken by any group be limited?

(A few noes)

MR. McFARLAND: It was stated at the beginning that the lid was off and you wanted to hear from everybody, and Doctor Marlatt said last evening he hoped we would all get it out of our systems. Why not get it out and have it over?

(Adjourned at 11:30 a. m. until 1:00 p. m.)

Is Lady: Mr. McFarland [illegible] here (indicating platform)? Mr. McFarland. [illegible]

MR. McPARLAND: Mr. Secretary, with your permission I will make my statement, partly from a manuscript which I had the honor to submit to you on the 20th of January, bringing it up to date, and at the same time introducing side lights which refer to the discussion this morning. I desire to take as little time as possible, and yet want as much as I can to make a complete statement of the case. I represent a committee constituted on the 15th of January 1920 at a nationally called meeting, held in New York at which were present some 45 organizations of various characters relating to plants in the United States, the dominant bodies there being wholly on the educational side, including also the great amateur societies devoted to the interests of special flowers. This committee formed a smaller executive committee which has continued its work since that time in investigating the matter of this quarantine and the law and was held many meetings and gone to considerable effort in order to acquaint itself with the facts from the standpoint of scientific and amateur horticulturists. This committee desires to be understood as not opposing a protective quarantine under the Act of August 20, 1912. It is indeed wholly in sympathy with the idea of establishing and enforcing reasonable protective measures to prevent the introduction into the United States of additional injurious tree, plant and similar pests and diseases.

~~(Pulls with paper)~~

The Committee on Horticultural Quarantine was constituted at a national conference held June 15, 1920, in New York City, participated in by representatives of the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, the Horticultural Society of New York, the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, the Wisconsin State Horticultural Society, the Missouri Botanical Garden, the Garden Club of America, the Woman's National Farm and Garden Association, The American Rose Society, The American Iris Society, the American Dahlia Society, The American Sweet Pea Society, and other horticultural organizations, predominantly representing the scientific and amateur horticulture of the United States. Since the Conference of June 15, 1920, the Directors of the New York Botanical Garden and of the Brooklyn Botanical Garden have participated in the discussions.

A small Executive Committee constituted by the general committee has held many meetings and has conducted an extended inquiry into the practice and effect of the regulations for the enforcement of Quarantine 37 above referred to.

1. The Committee desires to be understood as not opposing a protective quarantine under the Act of August 20, 1912. It is, indeed, wholly in sympathy with the idea of establishing and enforcing reasonable protective measures to prevent the introduction into the United States of additional seriously injurious tree, plant or fruit insects and diseases.

2. The Act approved August 20, 1912, entitled "An Act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests," etc., is obviously aimed at the protective exclusion from the United States and from spread among the states of "injurious plant diseases and insect pests," rather than at such regulation of imports as shall have the effect of tariff legislation. In Section 7 of the Act, referring particularly

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

to foreign importations, this purpose is clearly set forth in the words, "Whenever in order to prevent the introduction into the United States of any tree, plant or fruit disease, or of any injurious insect new to or not theretofore widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United States, the Secretary shall determine," etc., he may take certain protective measures.

3. The Act of August 20, 1912, above referred to, provides in Section 12 that for the purpose of carrying out its provisions "There shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture from existing bureaus and offices in the Department of Agriculture, including the Bureau of Entomology, the Bureau of Plant Industry, and the Forest Service, a Federal Horticultural Board consisting of five members, of whom not more than two shall be appointed from any one bureau or office, and who shall serve without additional compensation."

4. This Federal Horticultural Board is such only in name, being constituted of entomologists and pathologists, with one dendrologist. It is respectfully urged that as thus constituted, this Board is made up contrary to the plain implication of Section 12 of the Act of August 20, 1912, which specifically provides for a majority representation from the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Forest Service, and not for a personnel including a majority of those whose primary interests are in insects and diseases.

As a consequence, the employees, agents, inspectors and advisers of this Board have been and are, with perhaps recent exceptions, apparently ill-informed and unsympathetic in regard to plant life, and in some cases have shown grotesque ignorance of the conditions and needs of plant life in the administration of their duties, to the serious disadvantage of scientific and commercial horticulture. Evidence is available in proof of this statement, and the regulations of the Board are themselves such evidence, as will hereafter be shown.

It should here be noted that this statement urging a sane and proper adminis-

tration of a wholesome law is made directly to the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to the Federal Horticultural Board, because the latter has shown itself to be out of sympathy with the scientific and amateur horticulturists of the country, and apparently without a real basis of knowledge of plant life upon which to adequately decide, as to the future of American horticulture as it may relate to discoveries and originations in plant life abroad.

It should also here be stated that not one word in what I have said and read is intended in personal criticism of any member of the Federal Board or in derogation of his scientific attainments or his sincerity. The one thing I respectfully insist upon is that we have no part in claiming that the Federal Horticultural Board has any other than the finest intentions.

5. Quarantine No. 37, established under the provisions of the Act above cited, was "promulgated to take effect on and after June 1, 1919," and did then take effect. Regulations enforcing this quarantine have been frequently revised and extended, the last edition issued by the Federal Horticultural Board being marked "Effective on and after October 1, 1921," while a revised edition of HB-105, relating to the "entry of plant novelties and propagating stock," was issued January 1, 1922. Many circulars, supplements, and modifications of and to these regulations have been issued from time to time. Among these is an extended argument issued as HB-130, and dated February 25, 1921, largely devoted to a defense of the regulations enforcing Quarantine 37 and to an attack upon the single public utterance of this Committee, as well as upon all who object to the apparently arbitrary actions of this Board.

6. The statement is now broadly made that, departing from the purpose of the Act of August 20, 1912, to "prevent the introduction into the United States of any tree, plant or fruit disease, or of any injurious insect new to or not theretofore widely prevalent or distributed within and throughout the United

States," the Federal Horticultural Board has established and is maintaining a progressive embargo against the importation of plants from abroad, irrespective of the introduction on such plants of diseases or injurious insects. In proof of this attitude of the Federal Horticultural Board there is here cited a sentence from a letter dated December 24, 1921, signed by the Chairman of the Federal Horticultural Board, and addressed to the Chairman of this Committee:

> (A) "The whole spirit of Quarantine 37 is to as rapidly as possible make this country independent of foreign supplies, in the hope that some day we will reach a condition where no entry of foreign plants will be necessary, other than to make adequate introductions of new plants, and perhaps, occasionally, old plants which are needed for the establishment of new propagation enterprises and which are not commercially available here."

It is respectfully urged that this stated ideal, upon which serious progress has been made as shown by the attached letters from great scientific plant authorities, is not warranted by the Act of August 20, 1922.

It is further urged that the discrimination shown by the Federal Horticultural Board against private and amateur horticulturists and plant-lovers is wrongful, injurious to American horticulture, and contrary to the Act of Congress under which it is imposed. The evidence of such discrimination is found in paragraph 2 of page 3 of HB-105 as revised January 1, 1922, to which reference is made, and from which is here quoted only the concluding clause:

> (B) "Permits will not be issued to anyone for the importation of plants for personal use, such as the mere adornment of private estates."

It is well known among those who have participated for a generation or more in the advance of scientific, economic and commercial horticulture in the United States that upon such private and amateur interest has depended the introduction of many fruits, plants, shrubs, etc. of great value. Commercial interest follows, but seldom precedes, the amateur demand, and many great fruit collections and such great gardens as the wonderful Azalea collection at Magnolia, South Carolina,

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

the famous Rhododendron gardens at Wellesley, Mass., Professor Sargent's notable estate at Brookline, Mass., and scores of others, could not now exist had these restrictions been in force fifty years ago, nor can they continue to promote plant commerce if these restrictions are maintained.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I want to emphasize that fact. The nurseryman and the florist and the seedsman yield to a demand. They seldom create it. They can not afford to create demands except in rare instances. It is the amateur, the man who can spend his money for the thing he wants, regardless of his commercial applications, who brings it and talks about and writes about and makes it possible for the production to follow with the production of that particular thing of value which has been proved without cost to them.

Under what sanction of law does the Federal Horticultural Board decide just who shall import, and what he shall import, and from where, aside from the protective intent of the Act of August 20, 1912? Where in that Act is the authorization to make private plant collections so difficult to create and maintain as to virtually prohibit them?

This assumption of arbitrary control over the gardens of America is not honestly mitigated in the maintenance by the Federal Horticultural Board of an "accepted list of amateurs" who may import with less difficulty if they claim that "their collections are of real merit, and of distinct service to the public, or who represent that they are engaged in work of general public benefit with the plants concerned," to quote from a letter dated April 14, 1922, signed by the Chairman of the Federal Horticultural Board. Under this curious modification there exists an actual preferred list of amateur importers, who have privileges not accorded to other citizens, who are, by this preference, made advocates of a policy of restriction certainly neither stated or contemplated by the Act of August 20, 1912. Other amateurs who decline to participate in this subterfuge are prohibited from importing plants for "the mere adornment of private estates,"

as if there was any other object or purpose in the use of ornamental plants, foreign or domestic!

It has been urged by the Federal Horticultural Board that the private importations thus prohibited save by subterfuge would subject the nation to grave danger from the insects and diseases to combat which is the purpose of the Act of August 20, 1912. Such importation had been going on for at least one hundred and fifty years prior to the formation of the Federal Horticultural Board. What injury can be shown to have resulted in consequence? What injury is likely to occur should American amateurs be permitted to endeavor to make their gardens complete?

7. It is respectfully submitted that scientific authorities are not in accord respecting the necessity of the exclusions involved in the current Regulations enforcing Quarantine 37. It is not impossible that the danger from the reasonably unhampered importation of plant material has been exaggerated, and that the price of deprivation or inconvenience amounting to exclusion is greater than the citizens of the United States should pay. Certain it is that if the present hampering exclusions and restrictions had prevailed in earlier years, if all initiative as to seeking the best in the world for America had been restricted either to the Federal authorities or to commercial importers willing to brave the rigors and endure the losses now imposed, our orchards and gardens would be poorer in quality and beauty and our gainful productions far less.

If the nurserymen in this room at this time, Mr. Secretary, had to eliminate from their stocks of fruit trees and ornamental plants those which originated because of importations in the years passed by, their stocks would be mighty low. America, thank God, is a cosmopolitan nation, able to receive and care for the best of all the world. I see no red Indians in the room. You, yourself, are probably of good Scotch descent, as myself. You got in and I, myself got in. If our ancestors had been inspected and fumigated there would never have been any McFarlands or Wallaces in this country.

It is true that the authorities of the Department of Agriculture may import anything from anywhere at any time, but is it either equitable or desirable that the fine spirit of advance should be checked which has caused the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, the Missouri Botanical Garden, the New York Botanical Garden, the Brooklyn Botanic Garden, for example, to spend thousands of dollars and years of time in intrepid plant exploration, resulting in the bringing into the United States of many hundreds of beautiful and valuable plants?

They can, it is true, under regulations, import them in some such fashion as the importation made by an indignant gentleman who had gone to Sweden. Finding some apple trees he got a permit and imported them but when he eventually received the apple trees, after they got the third degree from the Federal Horticultural Board, they were a bunch of dry twigs and he did not attempt to plant them.

Examinations made by the inspectors of the Federal Horticultural Board of all of the botanical gardens above named seem not to have disclosed any real danger to the nation through these importations. It is not shown, we believe, that generations of advanced plant interest, resulting in great benefit to the nation through the work of these institutions, have also resulted in the intro-

duction of the additional injurious plant insects and diseases toward the exclusion of which the Act of August 20, 1912, is directed.

Letters submitted herewith from the Director of the Arnold Arboretum and from several professors standing high in entomological and horticultural endeavor emphasize the desirability at least of an open-minded study of the situation, and cast doubt on the wisdom of the current practice of the Federal Horticultural Board in the administration of Quarantine 37.

8. While this Committee is not directly concerned with the trade relationships to which the Federal Horticultural Board pays so much attention in its perversion of the Quarantine Act, it nevertheless respectfully calls attention to the inequities of the Regulations set up, and urges that the Secretary cause unbiased and impartial consideration to be given to these Regulations, by those outside the Department of Agriculture acquainted with plants and with the horticultural progress of the United States, to the end that legal importations may be made without the delay, difficulty and danger to the plants now imposed, and that with the establishment of a reasonable and not a pathological point of view, American plant lovers may again have access to desirable things better grown abroad, or not accessible in good quality anywhere in the United States.

9. It is respectfully urged that practice of the United States in relation to arbitrary exclusion and virtual embargo under the guise of quarantine differs materially from that of the government of Great Britain. No one who has traveled in England would for a moment suggest that that well-gardened land is less in danger from the introduction of additional injurious insects and diseases than is the sparsely cultivated United States. The legislation in force, as reported in an official publication issued by the Imperial Bureau of Entomology in London provides, under date of May 31, 1921, for the free admission of the plants so generally excluded from America, "provided they have been certified by

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

a competent official of the Phytopathological Service of the exporting country as healthy and free from certain scheduled pests." The authorities reserve the right to examine and to destroy in case of violations. The scheduled pests include six fungous diseases and thirteen insects, and a supplementary schedule adds eight other insects and pests that must not be found on the plants admitted, many of which, incidentally, are from the United States.

Why, if the danger is as great as is urged by the over-zealous Federal Horticultural Board, is not England devastated in consequence? Mr. Secretary, you have with you here a direct representative of the Government of England who will present to you, I hope, his observations of the matter.

10. In the voluminous literature, probably far exceeding that ever previously issued by any government bureau in its defense, the Federal Horticultural Board lays stress on the facilities of the Department of Agriculture itself for providing such new plants as in the judgment of this Board it may be desirable for the citizens of the United States to have. Objection is made to this implied centralization as not in accordance with anything found in the law, not in accordance with American practice, and as destructive of desirable advance in plant knowledge and plant use.

But if it should be granted that hereafter the Federal Horticultural Board and the Department of Agriculture should be depended upon for plant introductions, it becomes competent to ask where or how the interested public which pays the bills and receives the benefits can secure access to these introductions or inspect them for consideration. Where does the Department of Agriculture maintain such orderly and accessible plant collections for the public benefit as those in Highland Park, Rochester, in Lyndale Park, Minneapolis, in the Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, the Missouri Botanical Garden, the Brooklyn Botanic Garden, the New York Botanical Garden?

Mr. Secretary, there is not whole-hearted approval of these methods among those interested the nation over--at least as to the centralized authorities in Washington--in the exclusion of injurious insects and plant diseases. Prof. J. R. Cooper, head of the Horticultural Department of the University of Arkansas, writes in a letter "have felt hardships of the conditions imposed. Would be glad to see authority of the Board limited. Experimental work has been held up."

Professor Wilde of the Department of Horticulture of the Pennsylvania State College, writes "have been hindred by the quarantine in securing new and rare European plants and bulbs. Have secured permits but I am afraid imported material would be killed by fumigation. I believe in quarantine but as it stands today Quarantine 37 should be revised."

That is all we are asking for. We are not asking for the abandonment of the protective measures. We would rather have the baby live than take action if, on its birth, the doctor said "this kid might get diptheria, I will fumigate him."

Professor Maney, Chief of the Pomological Section of the Iowa State College, writes "it is time for the nursery interests and Federal Horticultural Board to get together and work out satisfactory measure to protect from foreign insects and diseases and at the same time give sufficient freedom to carry on legitimate importing business."

I bring to your attention certain very moderate suggestions as to relief, relief that can be accomplished within the law if we accept the idea that Quarantine 37 as it now stands is legal.

A. Additional ports of entry to be established, so that plants are not subjected to the damage of an enforced journey to and from Washington in the East or San Francisco in the West. New York, New Orleans, Boston and Tacoma are

suggested, in addition to Washington and San Francisco.

B. Only such bulbs should be excluded as those known to be likely to introduce diseases and injurious insects not already prevalent in the United States, ending the present absurdity of admitting but five classes and excluding many no more dangerous.

I realize the Federal Horticultural Board takes refuge behind the fact that these bulbs include 90 per cent of all bulbs imported. How can they, or you, or any other man, as a citizen of the United States, say I must have hyacinths when I want Scillas? What right is there? I should say this always with reference, however, first to necessary protection against the admission of injurious insects and plant diseases. I might explain by saying I heard a gentleman say not many hours ago that he had obtained a large amount of one of the excluded bulbs (Spanish Iris) grown in California according to these prepared prescriptions of the Federal Horticultural Board. When he looked at them he found them diseased. If they had never gotten out of California, the Lord knows they could never have gotten into California. Their walls are closed against plants from the rest of the world. They did get in. Not 10 per cent of the shipment could be grown and he returned the whole shipment and at the same time failed to avail himself of a permit to import 10,000 bulbs to be propagated in the United States because of a statement that there had been established in the United States sources of these bulbs sufficient to satisfy the reasonable needs and demands of the garden loving people. I don't see particularly why it should be the function of any gentleman of the Federal Horticultural Board to make my bulb garden to cost two or three or ten times as much as it used to by forcing people who don't know anything about bulb cultures to grow them while Holland has the soil and conditions to grow the bulbs which I want and have a right to have. It isn't a law of Congress but a law of mankind which great educators have found relating to es-

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

tablishment of high schools. For example, less than a week ago I talked with Professor Spaulding of Illinois and he told me a definite formula could be provided under which the distance from the high school would restrict the attendance, and told the School Board of my city that if their high school was nearly two miles distant it would be cheaper to run because the children would not go.

So it is, Mr. Secretary, that the interposition of these difficulties, these regulations, and these bonds simply prevent importation.

C. The abnormal condition should be remedied under which any one of many subjects may be freely admitted if called flower seeds, and submitted to red-tape and delay if called seeds of hardy perennial plants.

D. Discrimination by the Federal Horticultural Board should be ended as to what it considers new or worthy of trial or introduction, save as such proposed importations fall under the protective provisions of the law.

E. By cooperation with foreign plant-inspection authorities and foreign growers, the present total exclusion of plants having soil on their roots should be materially modified.

F. The requirement of a bond to follow the importation of plants that are permitted to come in should be modified in the direction of reasonableness and practicability, if not abandoned. There is no one word in the Act of August 20, 1912, which can be remotely construed as giving the Department of Agriculture authority to require a bond or following the plant after it is once received. I defy anyone to find a word there which will justify the apparent control which the Federal Horticultural Board seeks to have over plants after they are received. I met an American about a week ago who was just starting for Holland. He told me he had imported for one of his customers stock which could be grown here--more than 100,000 gladiolus bulbs and had to follow them for a year. That is an imposition. Of course, a bulb could be kept in a storehouse and looked at. That is no good. It must be planted. The only bulb which can be produced in one year

is not the bulb that was imported.

6. Unless it can be proved that the importation of plants, trees, bulbs, seeds, orchids, cuttings, etc., by the great scientific gardens of the nation heretofore mentioned has resulted in the introduction and dissemination of new and serious diseases and injurious insects within the prohibition of the act of 1912, these institutions should be permitted to import at their will, by mail or otherwise, upon such reasonable guarantees of inspection and protection as the Secretary of Agriculture may require.

The Missouri Botanic Garden has been importing for two generations. I am assured by its director, Dr. Moore, that a recent examination by the Federal Board disclosed so far as he can ascertain nothing injurious. The same experience seems to be true of all the other great botanic gardens. To be sure they can import, but they are afraid to subject their material to the treatment which it must get to follow the restrictions and so-called protection of the Federal Board. I am in mind of a thing told me something like a year ago by that wonderful plant explorer, E.R. Wilson, one of the most intricate men in this world, who spent parts of 11 years in explorations, six weeks up in Kwangsi in West China. He has sent in more than five hundred new species. In Korea he found an oak, utterly new and very beautiful and desirable. He got a hat full of the acorns, so he told me, half of them he sent according to the regulations of the Federal Board; they were fumigated and when they were put in process of germination one lived; of the other half all lived. The answer was obvious. I saw the tag which had been on the inspections and both were marked precautionary. There was no evidence of disease.

Now, Mr. Secretary I have accompanying this statement certain letters which I will not attempt to read, but simply name their origin in order that you may realize the sort of response we have received. Not one thing I have said is of my own motion.

~~(Follow with paper)~~

1. Letter from Dr. C. R. Crosby, Extension Entomologist in the Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, calling attention to the possible exaggeration of danger from the importation on live plants of further injurious insects and diseases, and asking certain pointed questions.

2. Letter from E. A. White, Professor of Floriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, directing attention to the inconsistency of excluding certain classes of bulbs, and to the absence of accuracy concerning sources of these bulbs in America in suggestions made by the Federal Horticultural Board. In the same letter is mention of personal observations abroad indicating the advantage of importation from localities where certain stock can be better produced than anywhere in America.

3. Letter from Dr. George T. Moore, Director of the Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis, Mo., generally referring to the unfortunate effects of Quarantine 37 on the scientific horticulture of the country; detailing a presumed inspection made of the Missouri Botanical Garden with failure to report the results thereof, and calling attention to a statement by Dr. Marlatt concerning some 20 permits said to have been granted to the Missouri Botanical Garden, which statement is not confirmed by Dr. Moore. (The statement in question was made by Dr. Marlatt in the course of an address to the American Pomological Society in December, 1920, reported on page 71 of the proceedings of that Society recently issued.)

4. Letter from Prof. Charles Sprague Sargent, Director of the Arnold Arboretum, Harvard University, Jamaica Plain, Mass., reciting briefly the work of that institution within the last fifty years, the way in which that work has been interfered with by the regulations of the Federal Horticultural Board, detailing the refusal of the Federal Horticultural Board to permit important seeds collected in Australia to be inspected in Boston, with the consequence that they are sent to England, and explaining why the regulations of the Federal Horticultural Board aimed at commercial relationships prevent the continuance of the work of the Arnold Arboretum.

5. Letter from Prof. N. L. Britton, Director-in-Chief of the New York Botanical Garden, Bronx Park, New York City, urging increase in the provisions for port inspections, the modification of the personnel of the present Federal Horticultural Board by bringing into it at least one representative of American horticulture, and advising the organization of an impartial investigation of the whole matter by experts not connected with the Government.

6. Letter from Dr. C. Stuart Gager, Director of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden, detailing the pleasant treatment he has experienced at the hands of the Federal Horticultural Board, stating the deprivation the Brooklyn Botanic Garden has suffered, and generally approving the items of relief specifically suggested in this statement to the Secretary of Agriculture. Dr. Gager adds: "I am firmly convinced that the time has come for a careful reconsideration of this whole question in the light of the experience which has accumulated since Quarantine 37 went into effect."

7. Letter from Frank A. Waugh, Professor of Landscape Gardening in the Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass., characterizing the activities of the Federal Horticultural Board as "distinctly detrimental of the interests of practical horticulture." (Professor Waugh in addition to his duties as Professor of Landscape Gardening, is likewise a practical and successful orchardist.)

[illegible]

8. Correspondence with Charles H. Totty Company, of Madison, N. J., running from October 13, 1921, to January 4, 1922, reciting the effort to obtain permission to import a new rose under number, and indicating that as shown in the letter of John A. Stevenson, Acting Plant Pathologist, under date of January 4, 1922, the Federal Horticultural Board is the judge of the value of any new thing which American horticulturists desire to try for the advantage of horticulture in this country.

9. Quotation from Bailey's Standard Cyclopedia of Horticulture (page 1291, Volume III) showing the dependence of American fruit-growing on foreign sources.

10. Telegram from Mrs. Francis King, President of the Woman's National Farm and Garden Association, reciting the effect of the quarantine on garden initiative in its two and one-half years of existence.

I am very glad Mr. Secretary, that we are gathered here today in that consideration.

There is present here also to be heard if you so desire, Mrs. Crowninshield representing the Garden Clubs of America, organizations which are doing much to advance horticulture in this country, and they are making the demand by which these gentlemen on both sides of the Atlantic live. If the women don't want to grow the plants they don't get bought. If the ladies don't get the plants to grow they don't know they want them. Another thing, as President of the American Civil Association I have had to visit more than 400 American communities, every time with the idea of trying to make that town a better place to live in. Every man here knows that the very first aid to get a town a better place is to get it green, to get the gardens better and get horticulture improved. Now, I have found this that the towns with the most gardens needs the least policemen; that the town with the best gardens is the most prosperous town. The theory, therefore, that we present to you this afternoon is to stop as soon as may be the errors committed by well-intentioned men who under the guise of an attempt to keep out insects and diseases, are in fact attempting to say what shall be done with plants in the United States. I submit, Mr. Secretary, that the Congress is absolutely competent either to enact a law totally excluding all plants if it wants to, or imposing so high a tariff as to produce the same effect if it wants to, or imposing so high a tariff as to produce the same effect if it wants to or to arrange for State isolation if it wants to, but I do not agree that the Act of August, 1912 gives that permission. Some years ago I was

in the State of Yucatan and they did not have any wheat there. They got it across the gulf of Mexico from the State Of Nuevo Leon, and they paid $4.50 a bushel for it to get it from one State to another. That was the limit, Mr. Secretary, of the kind of regulation we are heading toward if this matter continues. The step is easy from National regulation to State regulation and State isolation to where we cannot ship a plant across the border of the state for fear it may have a big or a disease. True, I think no such action is now in the minds of the Federal Board, but it is a natural corollary to the restrictions that have been considered. I sincerely hope as you consider all that will be said you will act for the real advantage of the American horticulture. We come here with clean hands, with nothing to get and nothing to lose. We come here because we are interested as you are in this nation, in its prosperity and its advance; we know it has grown mightily because there was contributed to it vast advantages from abroad, both in people and in plants, and we ask that there be not the attitude taken now that we are through with the rest of the world, that we can stand on our own feet, that we need no more plants and no more people and are sufficient unto ourselves. I hope the day will never come when that prediction becomes fact. (APPLAUSE)

MR. McHUTCHISON: Mr. Secretary, I have not the ability to present the case as Mr. McFarland has so ably done, but we have just made you a business statement from a businessman's point of view. As a rule we, in our group, are so busy that we have no time to learn how to speak. We have the thing very briefly put down here and I will read it.

First I want to say that the florists are probably more affected by Quarantine 37 than any other trade group. The Tariff and Legislative Committee of the Society of American Florists, of which I am Chairman, has given much time and thought to this problem and we offer what we believe and what we hope is a solution. We only ask, Mr. Secretary, that you consider our recommendations with an open mind. We are indeed pleased to be able to present them to you.

(Reading) This Committee speaks for the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists - the National organization of Florists, with which are affiliated more than 20 State and district Horticultural organizations having a combined membership of upwards of 10,000 and including practically all of the leading firms and horticulturists in the United States. We approach the Board in a spirit of cooperation, we offer you only constructive guidance, we seek only the best interest of our members consistent with the present and future interests of this country.

As to the purpose and scope of this Conference, what subjects would be considered here, we were informed by this Board and by Secretary Wallace that Quarantine 37 would be thrown open for a full and free discussion for the future guidance of the Department, so we prepared to cooperate on that basis. If the Board has new proposals to advance, we ask for sufficient time to consider them - thus avoiding snap judgment on important matters.

While offering constructive advice with regard to Quarantine 37 and advising changes in the Board's present policy, we credit the Board with the best inten-

Mr. [illegible], Mr. Secretary, I have not the ability to present the case as Mr. McFarland has so ably done, but we have just made you a business statement from a businessman's point of view. As a rule we, in our group, are so busy that we have no time to learn how to speak. We have the thing very briefly put down here and I will read it.

First I want to say that the Florists are probably more affected in comparison to the any other trade group. The Family and Legislative Committee of the Society of American Florists, of which I am Chairman, has given much time and thought to this problem and we offer what we believe and that we hope is a solution. We only ask, Mr. Secretary, that you consider our recommendations with an open mind. We are indeed pleased to be able to present them to you.

(Reading) This Committee speaks for the Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists - the National organization of Florists, with which are affiliated more than 50 State and district Horticultural organizations having a combined membership of upwards of 10,000 and representing practically all of the growing firms and horticulturists in the United States. We appreciate the Board in its desire of cooperation, we offer you only constructive criticism, we seek only the best interests of our members consistent with the present and future interests of the country.

In the Report and Rules of this Committee, that Department said to consider, we were guided by this Board and by Secretary McLain that Committee of seven be thrown open for a full and free discussion for the future welfare of the Department, so we prepared to cooperate on that basis. If the Board has changed its attitude, we ask for sufficient time to formulate a position on anything proposed or important matter.

With strictly conservative drive with regard to importation of and dealing in the Department's current policy, we really too hard with the Department

tions and ask that we be credited with a genuine desire to cooperate with the Board in carrying out its legitimate functions. We consider the Federal Horticultural Board a necessary and useful body - providing it adheres to its proper legal function - that of advising the Secretary of Agriculture how to combat existing pests and plant diseases and prevent the introduction of new or dangerous ones. We believe in Government control of imports and in thorough inspection and certification of imported plant products when necessary - but we protest vigorously against Quarantine 37 as administered, and which operates as a blanket economic embargo.

It is unfortunate that this Board is named "The Federal Horticultural Board" for its functions are entomological rather than horticultural. It is wrong that the U. S. Customs classification of "Nursery Stock" is used by the Board, for by including such classes of plant material as Orchids, palms, forcing bulbs and plants imported exclusively by Florists in the term "Nursery Stock" confusion is created in quite different interests.

(Verbal insertion: As an example of that, I understand that few florists came to the hearing preliminary to Quarantine 37, because the notice stated that the matter of nursery stock was to be considered. Florists are not concerned particularly with nursery stock. That is for nurserymen.)

Quarantine 37 excludes a far larger volume and variety of necessary plant material from Florists than from Nurserymen. We urge that the consideration of "Florists' Stock" imported by Florists, and "Nursery Stock" imported by Nurserymen, be kept quite separate at this Conference as far as practicable. In this statement we refer only to Florists' Stock imported by Florists.

Horticulture does not recognize boundaries; plants grow naturally in localities where climatic and other conditions are most favorable, so the best varieties growing in every civilized country today were imported from some other coun-

try. Our hot summers combined with our cold winters make it necessary for this country to import more raw materials and plant products than any other, and the prosperity of our citizens creates a larger demand for the best varieties of plant life than any other country enjoys. And as the Florists' industry in this country owes its enormous expansion largely to the diversified variety of plants and flowers it is able to offer the buying public, it is obvious that any restrictions on imports, especially on raw materials or plant products that cannot be commercially produced here, must be disastrous not only to Horticultural trade interests but ultimately to the United States.

To see why we need Government control of imports we must go back to the year 1912 just before the "Plant Quarantine Act" was passed by Congress; large shipments of plant products as well as Nursery Stock were arriving from foreign countries under no Federal control; some states had adequate inspection laws, properly enforced, other states had inadequate laws and lax enforcement, some states had no inspection law; so the Department said that in view of that lack of uniformity in statute and enforcement and the occasional absence of any inspection, and considering the common interest, the Department ought to be given authority to see that importations from districts harboring a pest new to this country or not generally distributed here, was given proper inspection by Federal officers.

That was the whole plea at that time; for inspection. The trade organizations recognized the necessity for such a law - the Florists are continually fighting insect pests and plant diseases, it is part of their business, and they wanted all the help the Department could give in combatting the existing pests and, of course, keeping out others - so the law was passed by Congress and gave the Secretary, through the Board, wide powers, then the quarantine orders began to come until we now have 54 of them. This law did not give the Board power to legislate, to prohibit imports because they happened to be Horticultural imports,

to build a Chinese wall around the United States in a Horticultural sense with a few small openings, in fact it limited the issuance of quarantine orders in these four important ways:

1. The Quarantine must be to prevent the introduction into the United States of insect pests and plant diseases,

2. which are new to or not heretofore widely prevalent or distributed within or throughout the United States.

3. The order can only prohibit importation from a country or locality where "such diseases or insect infestation exists" and

4. The country or locality, and the class of plant products to be excluded must be specified in the order.

If Belgium has say a dangerous disease which is new to or not widely prevalent here affecting Araucarias, this law gives power to exclude Araucarias from Belgium if that is the only way to exclude the disease; it clearly does not give the Department or the Board the power or right to exclude nearly all plant products from every country or locality on the earth on suspicion, as Quarantine 37 does.

We have outlined the original plan for inspection and certification as required by the Department and endorsed by the trade organizations; now let us come back to the present and see how far the Board has wandered from the original plan. I quote the words of the chairman of the Board as printed in the Florists' trade papers:

"As to returning to the old practically free entry of foreign plants, a test over a seven year period was given to the possibility of safeguarding such plant importations by inspection and disinfection, and this test indicated the absolute inadequacy and failure of this method of excluding new pests and forced the conclusion on this Department, and on the plant experts of all of our States, that the only safeguard for the future was the exclusion of all plant stock not abso-

lutely essential to the agricultural, horticultural and forestry needs of the United States."

In other words, the chairman says that having tried to do what the law authorized, and having failed, the Board decides to do something else; something entirely without and beyond the limits of the legal authority conferred by Congress. We Florists cannot agree with, or subscribe to, any proposition that it is necessary or effective to exclude important classes of plants and plant products because of the alleged inadequacy of inspection. If the Board's inspectors cannot do the work effectively, or lack equipment, then the Department can get other inspectors and provide the necessary equipment.

When the Board undertakes to say what plant materials this country needs and what it ought to be permitted to have, it wanders off into the field of economics and assumes powers it does not have and should not have; it has no present authority in law to decide such matters. The function of the Board is only to advise, and on scientific matters requiring expert knowledge of pests and plant diseases, and as such it is properly limited in its personnel to expert advisers on entomology and plant pathology. When it comes to deciding what plants and plant products the country requires, the Florists and Nurserymen can furnish expert knowledge on that subject which the Board does not claim to possess. It was not intended for this Board to decide such matters, for such experts are prone to consider plants as hosts and carriers of diseases and be critical and unsympathetic toward practical Horticulture.

Now let us look for a moment at the effect of the present policy of the Board as embodied in Quarantine 37 - and the full results are not yet visible. Belgium that shipped approximately 32,000 packages of plants and plant products annually prior to #37 (1934 tons in 1913) now ships less than 50 packages (3 tons in 1920). One little district in Holland (Boskoop) that formerly shipped 35,000

cases annually, now ships less than 300; our entire imports of plants and plant products, excluding bulbs, from Holland in 1920 was less than 3% of our 1916 imports. (The Holland-America Line carried in 1916, 81,636 cases of bulbs and 39,145 cases of Nursery Stock as against 14,036 cases of bulbs and 808 cases of Nursery Stock in 1920. Total 120,000 odd for 1916 and 14,000 odd for 1920). France and Japan that formerly shipped hundreds of varieties of Ornamentals, now ship none except under special permits. Out of the thousands of varieties and classes of plant products formerly imported we can now freely import but 7, of which 5 are bulbs - and these can only be imported under permit. Of the estimated 950,000 Azalea Indica formerly annually imported from Belgium, only an occasional plant is now to be seen at our National Flower Shows. Where are our Bay Trees, our Araucarias? Where are our new Orchids and hundreds of other exotics to come from? And yet the Board's chairman says that Quarantine 37 is not an embargo and points to the stock being allowed entry under special permits - which is equivalent to limiting the waters of the Potomac to what will come through a twelve inch pipe and pointing to the great volume of water that comes through the pipe (laughter). These conditions result in serious injury to American trade, the elimination of the ability of that trade to supply garden and flower lovers and American citizens in general with the plants they want at prices they can afford to pay, and this means practically the suffocation of horticultural development and progress.

And we are told that these restrictions and embargoes are necessary to protect the country from insect pests and plant diseases. The same argument could be used by medical enthusiasts to stop immigration to our shores to protect the country from human ills and diseases, but people would sicken and die just the same (laughter). Or the Police Department might shut out all immigration for fear that a criminal might occasionally come, but we would have crime just the same (laughter).

Recently there was found on our Eastern coasts a species of pile-worm that on Western coasts has caused millions of dollars worth of damage by attacking piles and other underwater structures, it came presumably with the barnacles on ships, and following the Board's reasoning it would be necessary to exclude all ships for fear they might bring the pile pest (laughter). We contend that exclusion of inspected plant materials does not exclude pests, and does not reduce the annual damage done by pests to our crops and forests. If the Board follows its present policy of excluding plant materials to its logical conclusion and excludes all merchandise and indeed all ships because of the suspicion that they might bring pests, it would not, in our opinion, reduce the sum total of damage by pests by any degree visible. The Gypsy moth was introduced into this country by a naturalist or entomologist at Harvard University, but the exclusion of all naturalists and entomologists in future from this country would not reduce the annual damage done by the Gypsy moth (laughter). You cannot change the course of nature by restrictions on business or exclusion of merchandise. Your purpose is laudable and right, but your method is dead wrong - the remedy is infinitely worse than the disease.

We are told that many of the pests that now plague us came in on shipments of plant products, but we contend that was before we had our present system of Federal and State inspection and before the exporting nations had theirs. We admit there are pests on all plant products, on home grown as well as on foreign grown, on our incoming shipments of greenhouse products as well as on our outgoing shipments of wheat and other cereals, but so long as these pests are not new or dangerous we should expect only the same degree of reasonable freedom from other nations' products as they expect of ours. Of Florists' imports fully 98% come from inspected establishments and 95% go direct into greenhouses, so the risk of importing new or dangerous pests with such shipments ~~it~~ is practically nil.

But if the Board considers such drastic remedies necessary, why not apply them to similar products not used by Florists? Why discriminate against Florists? Why exclude nearly all varieties of flowering bulbs without also excluding onions and all other bulbs not used by Florists? Quarantine 37 places no restrictions whatsoever on the importation of field, vegetable, or flower seeds, so why regulate and restrict the importation of Plam Seeds used by Florists without also regulating the importation of all other seeds representing 98% of total seed imports? Why exclude a few valuable orchid plants when the same ship brings in 40,000 bunches of bananas collected in the same forest?

(Verbal insertion: I have a letter from a gentleman who had just that experience. He went to Costa Rica and collected some orchids but he was not allowed to bring them in although the same ship brought that quantity of bananas.)

And why exclude, even on special permits, living plants which require a little soil to protect the roots while allowing shiploads of soil or earth arriving as ships' ballast to be dumped on our shores?

The Florists' trade is heartily in accord with this Board in carrying out the purpose for which it was created, but when the Board gets into economic or tariff fields no two Florists think alike for no two are affected alike, and some Florists, and Nurserymen too, undoubtedly are benefitted by the exclusion of plant products which compete with what they produce. As in all trades, there are selfish men in ours; a Florist who grows only one variety of Narcissus is benefitted by the exclusion of all other varieties of Narcissus and indeed of all other bulbs, while a Florist who grows only geraniums or bedding plants is benefitted by the exclusion of all plant products - but does such exclusion benefit the United States or even the majority of Florists? Naturally a handler of, say, terra-cotta is benefitted by the exclusion of brick and lumber, but would such exclusion benefit the United States or the building industry? Every bit of com-

If the Board continues such drastic restrictions indefinitely, they not only
ruin the dairy industry and hurt the Florida farmer, they discourage Flori-
ans from producing all varieties of diversified crops which are sadly
lacking in all other parts not used by Florida. Quantities of pineapples
are shipped from Hawaiian on the Gulf coast of Florida, vegetables, or flower seeds,
to the Pacific Coast and realize the importance of this trade and by forcing us
out also jeopardizing the importation of all other needs depending 90% of their
own importance. The economic a for valuable crops the same thing
brings in 50,000 tourists or increase salaries in the same thereby

Florida Investment. I have a letter from a prominent who not just too
anxious. He used to trade this and efficient some profits but he was not al-
lowed to bring them in although the same ship brought that quantity of bananas
and very cheap, even on equitable permits. Living plants which require a lit-
tle soil to protect the roots while allowing adjustments of soil or roots growing
on paper failed to be tested in our absence

The Florida' trade is heavily in hand with this Board in serving
the purpose for which it was created, but when the Board goes into commerce or
market finding as the Florida trade either for so has an affected either, and not
therefore, and there upset too, unfortunately are benefitted by the consumption of
plant products which compete with what they produce. As to all treaties, there are
difficult one in going a Florida who grade only the variety or limitations in how-
ever by the consumer of all other varieties of fruit and tubers of all
dairy farm, with a trivial one grow only grapefruit or lemon, plant to com-
pliance by the industry of all Gulf Coast - but that now Gulf-Coast breaks
the valley from or has the majority of Florida. Naturally a Russian or, any,
wine-drink is imported by the consumer or below our labor, but that
quantity benefits the United States or the United Kingdom. Open it or

ment that is favorable to Quarantine 37 we have heard or read from trade members treats only of the economic protection it gives them from competition (applause), not one commends it for the protection it was designed to give from pests. This seems conclusive to us that Quarantine 37 is considered an economic measure; we contend that economic protection is not included in the functions of this Board - that it is purely a tariff proposition.

Hundreds of varieties excluded by Quarantine 37 are not being commercially produced in this country, while the cost of production of other hundreds will prevent their quantity sale when produced. Home production should be encouraged and protected in every legitimate way, but by the tariff, not by this Board. The tariff bill now before the Senate provides duties more than double those now in effect, which will give home production all the protection it needs, especially when it is considered that prices in Europe are approximately three times what they were prior to Quarantine 37 and it will be many years before an adequate supply of necessities is again available.

(Verbal insertion: Many tradesmen have the idea that if Quarantine 37 is lifted there will be a lot of stock shipped over here from Europe. Anything which comes from Europe in the way of stock that is required will cost so much more than it did before that it will give this country all the economic protection it requires. I would not mind putting up capital and starting in growing azaleas today so far as foreign competition is concerned. I do not think those men need have any fear, If the Board keeps out of tariff matters,and if the Florists need more protection than they now have they only have to apply to the Tariff Committee.)

Summarizing our deductions, we submit to the Department of Agriculture these

Recommendations

1. We recommend that Quarantine 37 be withdrawn; it is indefensible even as

an economic measure. This will end the iniquitous system of "special permits" which is unfair, un-American and discriminatory, since the Board not only decides which variety may be imported and in what quantity, but by which firms or individuals. We submit that no firm should be permitted to import the same stock that another firm is not permitted to import - we need not comment on the abuses that can grow up under such a system. If there are any varieties of plants in Quarantine 37 which carry a real risk of introducing a "dangerous pest new to or not widely prevalent" in this country, the danger can be met effectively by specific quarantines as the law intended.

2. We further recommend the establishment at entry ports, especially at New York to begin with, of an inspection station where all imports of plants and plant products (excluding bulbs and seeds) will get adequate inspection. The cost of this Station and its maintenance will represent but a small fraction of what Quarantine 37 costs the country in loss of Customs duties on excluded products each season.

3. We recommend that the Board make accessible, to persons legitimately interested, information with regard to the special permits that have been issued since Quarantine 37 was promulgated, stating the class or variety of plant products, the quantity, the name of the importer and the country of origin. Secrecy in such matters invites charges of discrimination and favoritism in the issuance of special permits.

4. Should the Board contemplate quarantining additional items after withdrawing Quarantine 37, it is urged that the notice of hearing state precisely (not vaguely) which variety or varieties it is proposed to quarantine, and from which country or locality, so that the trade may have a chance to present its views in accordance with the intent of the law.

There is no doubt that with a little good will and cooperation on the part

of the Board, these recommendations can be made the basis for regulations covering the importation of plant products that will give adequate protection against the introduction of new or dangerous plant pests without prohibiting the importation of necessary plant materials. This country can not give a guarantee of absolute freedom of pests for our outgoing shipments and we should not demand it on our incoming shipments.

The Florists want a tariff high enough to discourage importation of all but the new and expensive varieties of Gladioli, Freesias, Ficus, Hydrangeas, Dwarf Roses and all other classes of plant products that can be commercially produced in this country, but we cannot ask this Board to cooperate with us on tariff matters even though this Committee is also the Tariff Committee, so our recommendations on economic protection have gone to Congress, as we feel that it is not the function of this Board to decide such matters.

In this statement we refer only to greenhouse products or plant materials used by Florists, carefully refraining from referring to "Nursery Stock" (as the term is understood in trade circles), as we leave recommendations on that subject entirely to the Nurserymen (applause).

(Verbal insertion: And, Mr. Secretary, we have no recommendations on Regulation 5. We object to the whole law. Out of 54 quarantines we object to only one).

(A supplemental report was submitted by Mr. McHutchison in letter of May 19, 1922. The portion of the letter relating to this report and the supplemental report follow:

May 19, 1922.

Dr. C. L. Marlatt,
Chairman, F. H. Board,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

When the session was adjourned Monday night I understood that the first

order of business Tuesday morning was to decide whether the discussion would be continued or committees formed - assuming that if the latter plan were adopted, time would be allowed for committees to get together and prepare their reports, so I had only a pencil memo when committee reports were called for Tuesday morning. I enclose a supplemental report which I trust you will see is added to our original statement and made part of the records of the Conference.* * *

Yours truly,

(sgd.) James McHutchison

Chairman.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

Washington, D. C.
May 16, 1922.

In confirming our written recommendations submitted at yesterday's session, this Committee desires to add these supplemental recommendations to be made part of the records of the Conference:

1. That all Florists' stock now excluded by Quarantine #37 be allowed entry under ordinary permits unless it is necessary to exclude specific items from specific localities in accordance with the Plant Quarantine Act.

2. That the Florists' stock now included in regulation 3 (Lily, Hyacinth, Tulip, Narcissus and Crocus Bulbs, Lily of the Valley, Pips, Rose Stocks, Palm Seeds) be continued to be allowed unlimited entry under ordinary permits.

3. That the "blanket" feature applying to Florists' stock in Quarantine #37, be made to apply to stock allowed unlimited entry under ordinary permits instead of restricted entry under special permits.

For the Committee,

(sgd.) James McHutchison,

Chairman.

THE SECRETARY: This paper has been handed to me containing the names of several gentlemen, -- Mr. Harrison representing the nurserymen.

MR. HARRISON: The Committee on Tariff and Legislation of the American Association of nurserymen met and we have passed a resolution which embodies about the exact opinion as expressed.

(INSERT RESOLUTION.)

?

paper per p. 111

MR. HARRISON: Right there I want to say as fruit growers and nurserymen the insect pests are the enemies that we have to fight every day. To my mind there is nothing so injurious, and if there is anything that can be done to stop the importation of further injurious insect pests that is what we want done at this time. In reference to rose stocks, I want to call on Prof. Humes of Florida.

PROF. HUMES. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Ladies and Gentlemen. I have been asked to say on behalf of the nurserymen a few words in regard to the rose stock situation as it appears to be at the present time in America. For a great many years we were dependent, of course, entirely upon foreign production of rose stocks. The putting into effect of Regulation 37 brought about an entirely new situation. First, it has brought about on the part of American propagators a very deep and searching inquiry into the matter of rose stocks as a whole with the result that instead of propagating practically all of our roses as we once did upon ~~Winetta~~ Manetti stocks that a great many other stocks have been brought into rose proparation, and I will say without fear of contradiction that this situation which has developed as a result of Quarantine 37 has been very much in the favor of rose growing in America. America is a large place and the rose stock which may be adapted to one section of the country is most certainly not adapted to another, and as a result, we know more about rosestocks in America today than possibly any other country knows about and out of it all is coming a very distinct inquiry into rose stocks. Now, then there are two distinct interests at stake in regard to the rose stock question in

[illegible] I want to say as fruit growers and shippers the insect pests are the enemies that we have to fight every day. To my mind there is not [illegible] so injurious, and if there is any thing [illegible] can be done to stop this importation of further injurious insect pests that is what we want done at this time. In reference to rose stocks, I want to call on Prof. Hopes of Illinois.

PROF. HOPES. Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, brethren and [illegible]. I have been asked to say on behalf of the nurserymen a few words in regard to the rose stock situation as it appears to us at the present time in America. For a great many years we have depended, of course, entirely upon foreign products as of rose stocks. The pestiferous effect of legislation BY brought about an entirely new situation. First, it has brought about on the part of American growers a very keen and searching inquiry into the matter of rose stocks as [illegible] into rose propagation, and I will say without fear of [illegible] that this situation which has developed as a result of [illegible] BY has been very much in the favor of rose growing in America. [illegible] in America today than [illegible] a very [illegible] and [illegible]

America. There is the man on the one hand who grows outdoor roses for outdoor planting. There is on the other hand the man who propagates roses in greenhouses for the production of cut flowers. What we have said in regard to the finding of new rose stocks has relation largely to the outdoor growing of roses. It appears to be apparent at the present time that the rose stock which is giving best satisfaction, and perhaps may continue to give the best satisfaction under greenhouse conditions in Minetta. Now, ~~Minetta~~ Manetti can be grown in America. Do not overlook that, Mr. Chairman, but whether this rose stock are entirely adapted to conditions of greenhouse culture, I am not prepared to say. Neither is anyone else here today exactly prepared to say, but I have a very deep and abiding faith in American soil, in American climate, and in the ingenuity of American propagator, and I believe that if the greenhouse propagator is not entirely satisfied with the Minetta produced in America at this time or whatever these difficulties are, they may be overcome. And I foresee that if in the wisdom of the Board, if, for instance, it wants to reduce the danger of introducing as they did last year brown tail moths and other pests, that we have in particular, I believe that the board will be entirely justified ultimately in cutting out the importations of ~~Minetta~~ Manetti rose stocks, and I think everybody, after a lapse of a number of years, will get along very well under these conditions. I was not authorized to make that last statement in regard to rose stocks by the men for whom I am speaking,

but I am simply giving vent to personal opinion. Now, I think, I am through on that matter, Mr. Secretary. I have been wondering, however, when I was sitting here when the time was coming for somebody else to voice an opinion that was contrary to the impressions that were made by the two gentlemen who preceded, and I wonder whether I should be in order to make replies to some of those of us that have been sitting there now or at some other date.

THE SECRETARY: Since you are on the floor, Professor, if I were you I would take advantage of the opportunity. (APPLAUSE)

PROFESSOR HUMES: I have no prepared brief; I have no written statement to present to this meeting, but I come from a State that has been through a fight that no other state went up against and succeeded with. I am standing on the floor, gentlemen, representing the State of Florida, through the Florida State Horticultural Society, an organization of between 2,500 and 3,000 members. I have in my pocket a resolution adopted at the last meeting of that society properly signed and attested by the Secretary of the Society which I would like to read at this time that it may become a part of the records of this meeting.

"WHEREAS there will be a hearing in Washington, D. C., on May 15th, 1922, before the Federal Horticultural Board, at the request of persons and agencies who oppose the continued enforcement of Quarantine No. 37 and who desire that this Quarantine be repealed, and

WHEREAS the repeal or modification of this Quarantine would be inimical to the Horticultural interests of Florida and the entire nation, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the Florida State Horticultural Society in its 35th Annual Session at Lakeland, Florida, held May 4th, 1922, that they are strongly opposed to the repeal or any modification of Quarantine No. 37 which will in any way interfere with its present effectiveness.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President or an Alternate named by him, be instructed to attend this hearing as a representative of this Society.

The above is a CERTIFIED COPY of that portion of the Resolutions adopted by the Florida State Horticultural Society in its 35th meeting at Lakeland, Fla. May 4, 1922."

(sgd.) Bayard F. Floyd
Secretary.

PROFESSOR HUMES: Now, gentlemen, prior to the year 1915 Florida was a dumping ground for anything that anybody might wish to send into the State. In 1915 Florida enacted what was known as the Florida Plant Act, and since that time we have been trying to keep things out. Now, the situation which developed with regard to Florida was this, that about the year 1912 a small shipment of citrus nursery stock was brought over from Japan and planted in an out-of-the way section of the State, and nobody heard of it or knew anything about it. A few years passed and we began to hear something about citrus canker, an undescribed disease; nobody knew what it was; no one had a name for it even, but in 1913 or 1914 perhaps, to be more exact, we realized in Florida that we were up against something that was a little bit different from anything we have ever tackled before, and before the end of the year 1914 we had reached the conclusion that the citrus industry of the State of Florida was absolutely at stake; that it was either the question so f r as we were concerned that citrus canker had to be taken out of the State of Florida or its citrus industry would disappear. There was no middle gound, and the State of Florida then undertook, as I made the statement a while ago, to do what no other state ever accomplished or even undertook to do, and that we to put out of the State of Florida citrus canker. We swet hard drops of perspiration over it; we swet blood over it; we spent approximately two million dollars of State and Federal funds in that fight, and I am happy to say that we succeeded, The cost was terrible. It is of regret

that 235,000 orchard trees in the State of Florida were destroyed in the process of getting rid of citrus canker, and Mr. Secretary, I would have defied any horticultural inspector, either in your Department or in the Department of any State in this union, to have detected that disease at the time it was brought in. Today there is an absolute quarantine against the importation of citrus nursery stock and no citrus stock from an adjoining state can get into the State of Florida. Now, then, we feel very deeply about the matter of Quarantine 37 in Florida because Florida is placed in a peculiar situation. We are a frontier State. We have more coastline than would stretch from the northern part of Florida clean up to Maine, and we are the guardians in Florida of that Section of coast-line. We have some job on our hands. No one in Florida, either florists, nurserymen or anyone else of any standing or worthwhile in the State of Florida but is solidly back of that State quarantine and is solidly back of Rule 37, don't forget it, and I want to say to you gentlemen while we are here discussing this thing, and I am going to take up the point that was handed to me by the gentleman. He said he had heard a lot about the exclusion of plants and he had heard a little about the exclusion of insects and diseases. Now, unfortunately these insects do no walk in where we can see them. Almost invariably they come in on plants, and he talks about the bottom of ships and ships holds and a lot of things like that as though he meant to tell me that because we could not close all the doors that we should not close any of them.

But it most certainly is of record that we had San Jose Scale, that we had white pine blister rust, that we had chestnut blight, and I might go on down the lines. The chestnut forests are gone or going and the white pine forests are following suit just because somebody wanted to bring into the United States a few chestnut trees that it did not make one wap of difference whether they had or not, and perhaps it was an amateur who wanted them. Now then some of the amateurs who are intensely interested are purely collectors and would be better collecting postage stamps; and there is another type of gentleman intensely interested in this matter and he is the man who has nothing invested in it but a desk and a few chairs and a certain amount of office rent; and there are a certain number of nurserymen interested in this proposition that have something invested in it perhaps. They are entitled to some consideration--not much perhaps--but some.

By the way, I want to tell you while I am at it that I make my living as a nurseryman. I am not trying to fly under any false colors.

There is another type interested in that, and that is the florist and in spite of all the row the florist is making at the present time the florists have made more money in the past four or five years than they ever made in that business in their lives before. Now then, ladies and gentlemen, who are the people to be considered in this matter? Not these classes I have indicated but when you get right down to the basic bottom of the whole thing the man who is to be considered is the man who is growing wheat back there, corn back there, oranges and grapefuit in Florida and California, the man who is growing apples, the man who is growing potatoes, and, gentlemen, in the interest of that class of people is the place where we have to put our protection. Talk about being unamerican--why it is the simple, logical thing for us to take care of ourselves as far as we can. Mr. Secretary I am sorry I did not have a pre-

pared speech. (Applause)

MR. ATKINS (representing the rose growers): Mr. Secretary, the question of producing roses has been assigned to me. It is a delicate subject. Professor Hume just treated with the foundation of the rose and I am going to make a few remarks about the rose. Some six or seven years ago there were a few hundred thousand roses produced in this country but the quantity did not scrape the surface of the demand. I am going to tell you gentlement that at this moment hundreds of thousands of roses are lying in the cellars of some of the rose producers in surplus over their demands. That is the whole thought of the rose business at this time. In spite of everything to the contrary, the rose producers are really producing more roses than the public in the United States can consume. That is all I have to say about the rose question.

MR. McHUTCHISON: Might I have a word to say on the subject of roses?

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: I think we will go through with our program first. We will allow various people to be heard, then have an open discussion.

MR. REID (representing American Farm Bureau Federation): Mr.Secretary, the American Farm Bureau Federation has filed with the Federal Horticultural Board--with the Secretary--statements from numerous Farm Bureaus about the country backing up the action of the Horticultural Board to the last ditch. They do this because they are interested in the protection of their crops. They are not specialists in the production of roses or bulbs, or importers of bulbs. They merely feel they have got to have proper quarantine facilities at every point of entry so that their crops will not be devastated every year or so with insects or diseases imported from Europe.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: Are there any other groups who have elected spokesmen and who wish to be heard now?

MR. E. G. HILL: I think I am entitled to have my say in regard to the rose question. I want to state some facts in regard to stocks for roses. At Richmond, Ind., we have given careful experiment to the trial of stocks other than Manettis. We have got stock from California called the Ragged Robin. The true name slips me. We gave that ample trial and it does not meet the requirements for winter forcement. We tried Japanese Multiflora. That will be the winter-flowering variety so it would sleep in the spring time. So on down through the list of six or seven varieties, and also we have tried seven roses and the only one for winter forcing is the Manetti. In Richmond we had something like 600,000 grafted roses. We grow our roses on Manetti stocks with splendid success. We would not think of using any other stock until we gave it a trial. I grant you these other stocks may succeed in different parts of the country, and no doubt do, and I rejoice that these stocks will grow roses for the garden and nurseryman, for we need stocks for producing roses from that particular line but I am emphatically of the opinion, and I think Mr. Pierson and Mr. Totty are also, that the only rose stock you can depend on is the Manetti. I listened to my good friend Mac here and brother McFarland, and I was wondering when they were talking if they were acquainted with the facts west of the Allegheny Mountains. I don't know of a florist but what has made good in a business way from the Allegheny Mountains to the Pacific. We are not hanging our harps on the willow. We don't complain of any of the depression up in the other sections. I honestly believe Quarantine 37 has been an important factor in the prosperity and upbuilding of the florists of the United States. If there are other factors conducive to it, bring them forward, let us understand

and know them. It has caused the florists to look around and produce stock. They have grown it themselves instead of sending their money across the water for these important articles as we formerly did to such a great extent prior to the war. We florists in America are capable of producing the stuff we need and want and I don't think there is any cause for bewailing the fact that some things are excluded. Another thing, Mr. McHutchison indicated that the florists were single minded, or at least that is what I gather, in respect to Quarantine 37. Let me tell you that 70 per cent of the florists west of the Allegheny Mountains are in favor of this quarantine and appreciate its benefits.

MR. ELLIOTT (representing the Elliott Nursery Co. of Pittsburgh): The statements of Mr. Hill about the prosperity of the florists in the West are true. Since the quarantine the Elliott Nursery Co. at least has been more prosperous than ever before. Nevertheless, the Elliott Nursery Co. opposes the quarantine on principle. My files were filled with protests--they come from the citrus grower of Florida and the wheat grower of Iowa. Daily I get inquiries "Why can't I have this?" It has been stated here that there is no protest against this quarantine from the people at large. That is hardly the fact. I would presume that the protest does not come to Washington. The people who want this stuff don't know there is a quarantine in effect. They come to persons like myself, and ask "Why don't you get it for me? It has disappeared from your catalogue. I don't see it there. Where can I get it?" They don't know it is not to be had. We are prosperous because prices have gone up. The material is more expensive than it used to be. I don't object. I like to be prosperous but hundreds of people in the United States who used to have a few plants are not having them now. They write to me protesting about the prices. There is nothing I can do.

It has also been stated here that there is no real hardship--that any material that is urgently needed may be had. For information on what I am about to state you had better refer to the files of the Federal Horticultural Board. In the early summer my propagator and several of my other associates made a study of the situation to decide what material we needed--what we ought to get for propagation to take care of future needs. We made a considerable list. Prominent among the list was peonies. We then started to find them. We motored to various nurseries and wrote to others. We came back, summarized the situation, and decided if possible we would import this material. Knowing the difficulties of importing and getting the material through in good order, we studied the situation and made up a special packing specification for the men on the other side, deciding to take a chance if we got the permit. We applied for a permit and were refused. I then protested, stating that while possibly this material was in the country, it was not available. I could not get it. Three or four weeks later I received a questionnaire from the Quarantine Board, and I would suppose every person in the trade was receiving that questionnaire, finding out what peonies were available. That would seem to imply that at the time my permit was refused on the ground that the stock was actually available, the Quarantine Board, as a matter of fact, had no information concerning what was or was not in the country. I get at the problem perhaps in a different manner. We are strictly retailers. We wholesale to nobody. We grow, purchase and import. We have no care concerning where we get the stuff so long as we get it. Is it available is our concern. Much of the stuff is no longer available. I would add further that I have been a nurseryman for less than three years. Prior to that I was a landscape architect and I still practice landscape gardening as opportunity offers. In the past I was concerned merely in solving problems of what material I would specify for this particular point. What is

the best material for this point? What will do best here? Now the question is "What can I get?" Much of the material can not be had at all. Other material has too high a price. No client will pay it except a millionaire. Millionaire clients, while desirable, are not common.

DR. TAYLOR (State Department of Agriculture, California): Ladies and Gentlemen, I have no intention of making any long speech, especially in view of the statement made by our friend, Mr. Humes. He has stated the situation which is almost identical with the situation in California except that we do not have to fight any citrus canker. The State Department of Agriculture represents the entire agricultural population of the State of California, the next to the largest state in the Union. By virtue of our peculiar climatic conditions we have an enormous range of plants of all kinds which can be grown successfully there. The result is that we have had in the past to fact importations of almost every kind of plant that will grow on the face of the earth into that State. Many plant pests have been brought in as have been detailed to you before. The people of our State recognizing the efficiency of the State Department of Agriculture in carrying out the quarantines that our State legislature imposes, provided for last year, the state legislature practically doubled the amount of money available during the present biennium for the use of the Department of Agriculture, and continuing to broaden its quarantine regulations and enforcing its quarantine regulations more effectively. That is sufficient evidence to show you the feeling of the people of the State of California as regards the operation of the State Department of Horticulture and Forestry enforcing these very strict regulations. I believe it is pretty well understood that California and Florida maintain the strictest quarantines of any states in the union. I have simply come here this afternoon at the direction of the Department of Agriculture, and also at the specific request of the governor of the

State as well to express to this body assembled here and the Secretary of Agriculture and the members of the trade the fact that we stand behind Quarantine 37; we do not want it weakened; we want it strengthened. Thank you.

MR. McFARLAND: May I have the privilege of asking the gentleman a question.

THE SECRETARY: Suppose we get through with the statements first.

MR. ~~SPRULING~~: Representing the Stumpp & Walter Co., seedsmen. I notice in the program here you mention the bulb subject. You say: "With respect to bulbs, any change in that schedule should be based on availability and this factor should govern both in the matter of additions to the list or to deductions therefrom. With respect to the bulb item, the Department merely wishes to be advised and to act justly on the facts of the situation." I think previous to the quarantine Mr. McFarland and myself had the pleasure and the privilege of meeting with your board in relation to the miscellaneous item of bulbs, and at that time the subject came up to this extent that the bulbs that were restricted entry could be had in the United States. Those items were listed in our catalogue at that time. Since that time we have been unable to procure them. They are not in our catalogue now; we cannot get them. We have issued a good many catalogues to the trade; throughout the country the amateurs have been depending upon us and like seedmen, like Henderson and Vaughn and a good many others to get these bulbs in connection with other bulbs they purchase in the fall of the year. We cannot get them now, and I think it would be a good idea for the Board to consider seriously the permission to enter some of these bulbs and amend the Act in that connection.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Secretary, I merely want to say that I am here as the spokesman and representative of the State Plant Board of Florida. That is an organization created at the behest of the growers and nurserymen of the State and supported by appropriations from the State Legislature in accordance with the wishes of the growers and nurserymen. I am instructed, Mr. Secretary, to say to you that the State Plant Board of Florida favors revision of Quarantine 37, upward, sir. We have a good quarantine service in Florida; we are proud of it; Floridians are in the habit of referring to our quarantine service as the first line of defense, and to the men engaged in that work as the men on the firing line, the men in the trenches, but, Mr. Secretary, Floridians are also accustomed to thinking of Quarantine 37 as the barb-wire entanglements on the trenches. We do not want these barb-wire entanglements weakened; we do not want any strands taken from them;; we do not want any lines put through these barb-wire entanglements; if anything we want them strengthened, certainly not weakened. Now, there is a phase of this situation that has struck me all day long, Mr. Secretary, and I am going to address a few remarks to these nurserymen and others who are interested. It seems to me that some very unjust and unfair criticism has been launched against the Federal Board. I say, against the Federal Board. There may be some grounds for the criticism which I have in mind, but it is unfair to alunch that criticism against the board itself. I have in mind this, Mr. Secretary, a gentleman says he asks for a permit

and it is some time before he gets it. That may be so. That is a matter of office detail which may be corrected. The gentleman may not have asked a reasonable length of time in advance of the time when he expects to need his permit. The Federal Board through its clerical force may not have given the attention to that request which it required, and that is merely a matter of office detail which can be corrected. Then, too, the Federal Board is criticised most harshly because importers who are getting a certain line of stock under permit are subjected to delays and financial loss by reason of the extra expense to which they are put to in sending these plants to Washington or to San Francisco. Now I want to say to you gentlemen, that the fault does not lie with the Federal Board. If these critics would put in the same amount of time and energy in supporting the Federal Board and obtaining adequate appropriations to provide facilities for inspection then the Federal Board would without doubt be glad to put suitable inspection force at Boston, at New York, at New Orleans, at Seattle, as well as at Washington and at San Francisco. (APPLAUSE)

MR. STARCHER: State Board of Horticulture of Alabama. If I were to speak in the same way as my friend, Mr. Humes of Florida, I would tell you exactly what took place in Alabama at exactly the same time. At one time 435 of our citrus groves were attacked by citrus canker. Alabama had no such funds available as had Florida, and if it had not been for the good grace of the United States Department of Agriculture

in backing us up in a wonderful way all the money Florida spent would have been lost because Alabama would have been a breeding place for citrus canker. Today I want to say that so far as our board knows and the representatives of the U.S.Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry, who are inspecting our groves in Alabama there is not one single bit of citrus canker in that State, and we have saved an industry at an expense to Alabama at not over $25,000 and an expense to the U.S.Department of Agriculture of near $200,000 that is today worth $6,000,000 and is growing very, very rapidly. On the 5th day of this month the Alabama State Board of Horticulture made and passed a resolution which the Chairman of the Federal Horticultural Board has on his desk, at least I sent it to him under special delivery expressing the wish of the Alabama State Board of Horticulture that no modification be made.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I have been requested by the Mississippi State Plant Board to introduce into the record this telegram. It is addressed to me: "Since it is impossible for Mississippi Plant Board to have personal representation at the Quarantine 37 Conference we will greatly appreciate if you will convey to the conference our opinion that this quarantine should not be modified in any particular likely to weaken the protection it is now affording Mississippi and the United States against the introduction of insect pests and plant diseases."

MR. ~~BOGARDUS~~, State Department of Agriculture, Texas. Mr. Chairman, members of the Federal Horticultural Board, it is the desire of the

Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Texas that I state to the Secretary of Agriculture and the members of the Federal Horticultural Board, and to those in attendance at this meeting that he is not in favor of weakening this quarantine but if anything ~~in~~ strengthening it. As the other representatives of the Southern States have told you they were fighting citrus canker, Texas is also making an attempt to eradicate citrus canker from the citrus trees of its section. Texas has a citrus industry that is rapidly developing and the citizens of that territory are eager and anxious for all the protection they can get, and it is hardly necessary to read the statements made by the representatives of the various states here, but Texas is thoroughly in favor of quarantine 37, and if anything we desire to strengthen it.

MR. BRITTON (State Entomologist of Connecticut): I am one of those entomologists about which it has been said that if we were all killed the pests would go on multiplying faster than ever. I will grant that. Before that is carried out, so far as Connecticut is concerned, I would like to have the nurserymen and florists of Connecticut decide the issue. No doubt the service might be bettered if you killed off some. The same might be true of the florists and nurserymen.

I would like to mention a few points. It has been stated here that plant growers, nurserymen, and florists are better qualified than anybody else to give information on the quantities and kinds of plants needed. I think we are willing to grant that statement. But I do not, and I wish to submit, Mr. Secretary--I do not think they will be better qualified to pass on the legal provisions of this Quarantine 37 than are the counsel employed by the Government. Neither do I think they are better qualified to pass on the danger of certain insects and plant diseases than are the specialists on those subjects. One of the speakers mentioned this pile worm or ship worm. That is nothing new. It has been known in this country longer than he or I can remember. There are new pests being brought in on plants all the time. Some of the florists and nurserymen have referred to the entomologists as wanting to keep up this quarantine in order to hold down their jobs. Great Heavens, if my position depended on inspection of imported nursery or florist stock I would be glad to give it up any time. So far as I am concerned, personally, it makes no difference, but I do consider that a repeal of Quarantine 37 would be a mistake for the best interests of this country. It would be my judgment not to repeal it. It may be possible and I think it is possible to make certain modifications here and there but a wholesale repeal of the law I think would be a great mistake. I thank you.

MR. WOODBURY: I wish to submit the following resolution which was adopted by the Board of Directors of the National Canners Association:

(reading) The losses suffered by canners and growers of canning crops from injurious insects and plant diseases which have been introduced from foreign countries into the United States constitute a serious hazard in crop production. It is to the interest of the manufacturer, the grower, and the consumer of canned foods that the loss and expense arising from such sources be minimized to the greatest possible extent through efficient plant quarantine regulations. The European corn borer, the Japanese beetle, the peach moth, and certain scale insects are examples of enemies to canning crops which might have been excluded if efficient plant quarantine regulations had been in force in earlier years for the protection of the public.

Inasmuch as there is a continuing danger of importation of other insect pests and plant diseases which may be capable of causing additional enormous losses,

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Board of Directors of the National Canners Association strongly urge the desirability of maintaining vigorous and efficient Federal Plant quarantine service, embodying the general principles of Quarantine Regulation 37, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That copy of this resolution and preamble be transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture.

MR. R. N. WILSON (representing Agricultural Legislative Committee of California): I am representing the Agricultural Legislative Committee of California, which is an organization of 60,000 growers, including the following:

California Almond Growers' Exchange
California Peach & Fig Growers
California Fruit Growers' Exchange
Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union
California Prune & Apricot Growers, Inc.
California Growers' Association of Los Angeles
Fruit Growers of California, Inc.
California Fruit Exchange
California Pear Growers' Association
California Walnut Growers' Association

and also the California Association of Nurserymen. I want to speak from the standpoint of the grower alone. We have had in California for a long time--long before the creation of the Horticultural Board--a quarantine service which was built of necessity and at the request of farmers and fruit growers of California. We have recently asked a hearing in California before this Board which has been granted. It is to be held the latter part of this month. We asked them to come there to strengthen our quarantine service. The reason we need quarantines is the same reason as expressed by the gentleman from Florida and Mr. Taylor of California. We have brought in material that cost us a lot of money. We have several pests facing us, the alfalfa weevil, Mexican orange maggot, the Mediterranean fruit fly. We need the assistance of this Board. We heartily approve of this rule and hope it will be strengthened rather than otherwise.

MR. BERT BALL (reprsenting Spring Wheat Crop Improvement Assn.): You opened this Pandora's box that made us so much work, but it is out of that Pandora's box that the insects, diseases, weeds--all of them--came that cost us more in taxes every year than the soldiers' bonus and all the war troubles together. Who is fighting it? Who is letting them in? Who are our allies? Who are our enemies? We know that Aphis is the bugaboo bug of all you people, also the green bug of

[illegible] I am requesting the executive committee [illegible] of California, [illegible] the organization of an [illegible] growers, including the following:

California Plant Growers' Exchange
California Seed & Bulb Growers
California Fruit Growers' Exchange
Consequal [illegible] Growers' Union
California Grape & Walnut Growers, Inc.
California Growers' Association of Los Angeles
Fruit Growers of California, Inc.
California Fruit Growers
California Fruit Growers' Association
California Walnut Growers' Association

and also the California Association of Growers. I want to speak from the standpoint of the grower alone. We have had in California for a long time—long before the creation of the Horticultural Board—a quarantine service which was built of necessity and at the request of farmers and fruit growers of California. We have recently added a Bureau in California before this Board which has been growing. It is a unit for activity just in this state. We also have in view limit to strengthen our horticultural service. The reason we need legislation is the same reason as mentioned by the previous from Florida and so, which of California. We were brought to attention that cost us a lot of money. We have entered quite strong on the activity work, which cross dispute, the believe growers fruit [illegible]. We need the assistance of this Board. We heartily approve of this rule and hope it will be strengthened rather than relaxed.

Mr. [illegible] inquiring [illegible] this [illegible]. The second [illegible] problem's one that has to be [illegible]. For it is out of line [illegible] the laxity, licensed, nurseries or [illegible] that [illegible] is [illegible] every year from the [illegible] [illegible] all [illegible]. The [illegible] is fighting [illegible]. We are [illegible]. We [illegible] [illegible] that right is the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

of Kansas. Have any of you read up on it and know how prolific it is? Not one of you can follow me and get these figures. One green bug, both through eggs and life progeny, will give you in one season 222,759,713,969,919,923,828,212. Let me tell you about that many green bugs are on each stalk. So figure it out what this foreign importation from Italy cost in green bugs alone.

Where did the Hessian fly come from? We don't want to repeat this foolishness of bringing in hired soldiers from England and bring in the Hessian fly to devastate whole territories. The alfalfa weevil on our border is coming in every year and it is a new bug. Remember what Nat Goodwin used to say, "When you are west of Broadway you are camping out." That is the way it is it seems to me Mr. Secretary. A good deal of this I would call a sentimental beauty. I have a country place of my own. It can not be more beautiful than I can possibly make it with my resources.

In Virginia, in 1918, the nematode disease caused by the eel worm showed its ugly head. If that gets out, God help our wheat again. Somebody said the reason for all these pests is that a certain amount of fleas is good for dogs and if we did not have enemies we would have too much to eat. Illinois will be shaking in her boots if that corn stalk borer ever gets there from New England.

It is not up to me to say anything about fruit flies, the coddling moth, and other things which came in, but from the bugs we have, we have difficulties enough to grow any respectable wheat for our daily bread.

The next question is weeds. Doctor Pammel of Iowa says we are importing many new weeds every year which become epidemic and which we can never again get rid of. Doctor Walster says that because of the weeds North Dakota can not carry out fertilizer experiments because the action of the weeds nullifys all of the good work. The Bureau of Markets is spending large sums and we come right back

to our Uncle Sam to overcome all these things with appropriations. We have gone through seed boxes of the wheat planters and have found from 2 per cent to more than 5 per cent--some cases 18 per cent--foul stuff and most of it is imported weeds. They are coming down from Canada and unless we check them they are going to play the very devil with our wheat. Too many say we are trying to lock the door after the horse is stolen, but we still have some horses.

We have this take-all disease in Illinois which came in from Australia. We have glag smut which in its native heath often takes as much as 10 per cent, and the Lord knows we have enough smuts, barley, oat, wheat, rye, without any others. There is another imported disease showing up in Kansas, called foot rot. Nobody knows much about it. Let me tell you about the greatest of all our curses in wheat. There was a dear old soul, probably an amateur, who wanted barberry candles in the good old days. What happened? Those families from New England imported those barberry bushes, took them West, and wherever you find a New England settlement the barberry bush is the thickest. By that means we got the black rust of wheat, from those plants which were imported for those candles and their sentimental value. Twenty million acres in South Dakota, North Dakota, Minnesota, and in the spring wheat section, are devastated every year by the black rust which came from this dear old soul's sentimental idea--an amateur perhaps--of barberry candles for Christmas.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary and Federal Board, I am with these other fellows. Don't make us work any harder. I am not a scientist, but God by with you in your work.

MR. SEYMOUR: The barberry candle to which Mr. Ball refers is probably the bayberry candle made from the bayberry in the eastern section and is quite a different thing and has no relation, I think, to the barberry.

MR. BALL: It don't matter. The old lady was an amateur and imported the bush.

PROF. L. R. TAFT, Department of Agriculture of Michigan: One of the duties of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Michigan is to prevent the introduction and spread of dangerous insects and diseases, and our experience for thirty years leads us to favor retaining Quarantine 37. We have been through three cycles of experience. We may say for ten years we had no inspection and no quarantine. The result was we were the dumping place for all kinds of diseased and infested nursery stock. At that time the San Jose scale came to us and caused us a loss of millions of dollars. Afterwards we had the inspection service and that was a great help. We kept out the brown-tail moth and other insects. We could not keep out, however, the white pine blister rust and Chestnut blight No inspection could do that. A careful inspection of the stock would not show their presence but afterwards we found the trees infested. Then we turned to quarantine and were only too glad to have the help of the Federal Government in this, and we feel, gentlemen, that unless we can have this back of us we will have to put up a barrier all around and shut out European shipments, and perhaps too those from other states unless they ~~took~~ take pains to quarantine and carefully rid themselves of these insects. Therefore, Mr. Secretary, and members of the Board, I was asked to come here by our Department and say that we are back of you in this Quarantine.

MR. W. L. MERSE, Georgia. I am with the Georgia State Board of Entomology. I am not going to make a speech; we have heard enough; much has been said about Rule No. 37, and I, as the representative of the Department of Agriculture and the Georgia State Board of Entomology want to go on record as approving Quarantine 37 as it now stands.

MR. J. G. SANDERS, Pennsylvania. I come before you as a director of the Bureau of Plant Industry of Pennsylvania; also in another capacity, as President of the American Association of ~~American~~ Economic Entomologists. It is not necessary, I believe, for me to talk at length regarding the judgment of the entomologists with respect to quarantine 37 because they have so often expressed themselves as strongly in favor of it, but I do want to ~~review~~ refute a certain bit of propaganda which has been going around during the past year or two that there is danger of the various states asking State quarantines, in other words, causing State isolation, provided quarantine 37 continues to exist. On the contrary, unless quarantine 37 continues to exist in full force there is danger of State isolation. Most decidedly. Because we recognize that not all States by any means have uniform facilities and those that have inspection work try to help one another in every way possible, yet it is impossible when you consider that there are forty odd states with their own inspection service, which are not at all uniform. I believe it is perfectly safe for me to say that the entomologists of which the horticultural inspection section is a group, that they are a unit in standing behind quarantine 37, and they do not wish any dimunition in its powers, but rather wish the retention of the quarantine in its present form or such minor changes as may seem desirable after experience ~~in~~ and investigation ~~has~~ have shown such changes to be desirable. The fundamental premises of quarantine 37 we feel to be right and proper, Mr. Secretary.

MR. McBETH, Ohio. I represent the small nursery interest in the middle West, in Ohio, and the rose growers of Springfield, Ohio. Some of you gentlemen know it is on the map, and they produce under glass, the principal part of these growers grow under glass; they have over a million feet of glass in use in growing roses, a million and a half under glass, but about one mil ion in roses, and h ve a capital of a little over a million dollars, and they produce 9,250,000 roses each year. Now, I am interested in the nursery business, and I represent 250 acres of nursery around Springfield, and $150,000 capital, and we don't know of any roses; we are in the market for some roses if anybody has them to sell, This 9,250,000 roses that we produced last year were sold up last year. Now, I also represent a perennial garden of 250 acres. We are going to have a communication from them read. Now, I want to reply to Mr. McFarland on that bulb proposition. If he will go to Dayton, Ohio, he will find a man there producing bulbs, tuplips and hyacinths that I will say they are eq al to any bulbs ever grown in Holland or Germany. What we want is to know whether we can produce them or not, and if we c o all we have to do is to find the market and we will have the goods. And then, the man who spoke about importing bananas and orchids on the same ship. Now, did he ever find an insect on the banana that attacked orchids. I do not believe he did. You might just as well say be brough wheat and orchids in the same boat. That I think is the whole shooting match is a foreign propaganda, a foreign nursery propaganda, gentlemen, I think so. Now, it has been said that the plants could be produced in this

country. The idea was that it would take so long for the foreign nurserymen to raise up a stock, their stocks are depleted and their prices are so high that there is no danger of introducing them into this country in competition with us. How about eight cents labor compared to our labor? I am paying forty cents an hour for labor and can not get decent labor for less than that and they are getting as good labor in France and Germany and Holland for eight cents as we are paying forty cents for here. Do you think we can compete with them? Not by a whole lot. Now, I want to read two communications. One is a letter from the Springfield Perennial Gardens, addressed to Hon. H. C. Wallace, Department of Agriculture:

> "We were probably the largest importers of Paeonies in the country until the quarantine went on. Now we find we can grow better bulbs than we imported and free from insect pests and fungus diseases, which was not the case with imported plants. We are strongly in favor of Quarantine 37 as it now stands."

The other is a telegram addressed to me, from McGregor Bros. Co., Springfield, Ohio:

> "As representative of plant growers of this city and section please convey to the honorable committee of the Federal Horticultural Plant Board granting the hearing Monday our sincere request that no change be made in Quarantine Order No. 37 that will take from America floriculturists, horticulturists, agriculturists, or American forestry that protection it affords against the introduction of dangerous insects and plant diseases and that protection and stimulus also that it gives to American propagations and growers especially because of large and increasing investment which would be seriously affected by changes."

These letters represent the sentiment of all of them. They are all in favor of quarantine 37 not to be modified, if anything to be increased. While this quarantine was being discussed before it went on, up at the Illinois Nursery Convention, a man got up and said that we did not have the ability and the stock, and I forget what all, that we could not supply our demand and therefore could not have quarantine 37. I jumped up and said that that was an insult to American propagators. I am glad to say that I am about ready to verify that now. I have some spruce and maples and biotes? that have been grown here under my supervision, and I do not think there is anything better furnished from Holland.

MR. OLSEN: I have directions from the Governor of Illinois to attend this conference and voice our approval of Quarantine 37 as it stands. We have had to quarantine against the corn borer. We have had to quarantine locally the counties of Madison and Saint Clair on account of the flag smut, and we appreciate the necessity of maintaining the quarantine as it stands.

MR. VAUGHAN: Doctor Marlatt has said wisely this morning that the great body of people to be considered in the consideration of the Plant Quarantine Act and its regulations are the amateurs, the great body of ever increasing plant lovers of America. For forty years, in catalogues and counter trade I have come in contact with this ever growing body of people. I turned over to the Secretary this morning a telegram from Mr. Irish, the leading entomologist at Charles City, Ia., for many years. His wire was that to his knowledge no new destructive diseases or insect enemies have been discovered in the world during the last five years. I started to say that I come in contact with this great body of plant lovers. There will be 3,000 people in our shop at Chicago asking "where can we get bleeding hearts and begonias?" I will have to tell them to ask their Senator. They come to us in the fall for Scillas and such things. When this Board put the quarantine into effect they would not change one little item whether rightly or wrongly rejected. This great body of American people will not be satisfied with the enforcement of Quarantine 37 as it reads today. The items shut out are not rightfully shut out. You never will get rid of this fight until you give it real consideration. This Board seems to have taken on a campaign to compel us to buy in America, even at triple prices and inferior stocks in limited quantities, carrying such prices forward to the consumer at almost prohibitive prices. A few years ago certain plants were sold for 6 cents each. Today a few dealers to whom the Board will refer you wholesale them for 25 cents. Twenty-five or twenty-seven years ago that great country of South

Mr. GLOVER: I have distributed from the Secretary of ILI Hall to attend this conference and voice our approval of Guardians EV on it stands. We have had to quarrel with the open boards. We have had to guardians locally the convention of Medicos and Rotas Clubs on account of the flag area, and we appreciate the necessity of maintaining the qualitative as it stands.

Mr. VERNON: Senator Hartzet has said already this morning that the great body of people to be considered in the consideration of the Flint Convention Act and its regulations are the customers, the great body of ever increasing, ever loving of America. For forty years, in conferences and popular trade I have come in contact with this ever growing body of people. I turned over in the Secretary's mind a letter from Mr. Cole, the leading psychologist of Chicago, Ill., for many years. He says he has in his handbook in his analytic classes or travel classes have been discussed in the local order for the five years. I stated to my that I came in contact with this great body of ilint in-area. There will be 8,000 people in our shop at Chicago meeting where can by pal finding Sports are impossible? I will have to call them to the well-rooms. Only one in ex ex the rail in Jackies and each fellow. Can his board put the guarantee into effect they would not change our little ilint dealer family or transit relation. This great body of American people will not be satisfied with the enforcement of Guardians EV on it would injure the ilint that are not politically dead too. The moves will get rid of this flint small pre-dive it will multiplication. This Sport seems to my mind a complete w magnet to top in meeting, even at high prices and increase above in flint quality, Sporting and giving Tennis to the measure of almost publication rates. A few years ago atlantic flint was sold for 2 cents. Today I try Senator to show the Jacks will enter pay dollards than for flint. Sportsmen is twenty-seven years ago and equal average of Jacks

America--Rio de Janeiro--brought to the World Fair the Caladium, a fancy plant. Twenty-seven years later I asked for permission to import this fancy Caladium and I was told there was an ample supply existing in this country and referred to a party in Florida. I filed with the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture a statement from this individual in Florida stating he had orders in former years for 70,000 and was unable to supply a single bulb. That is misinformation from this Board and they refused to permit me to import them. The fine conservatories in the finest homes in America need that plant as Mr. Eisele will testify. That may be a blunder. As Doctor Marlatt stated, they all pass through the highest authority in the Department of Agriculture before they are refused, I submit I am in wrong with the Department or something is wrong with the Department. I think it can be remedied. We are not fighting the quarantine. We are fighting the shutting out of good and desirable plants. Professor Irish's telegram shows a lack of proof that these diseases are in these plants. We have had them for 70 years from Belgium, Holland, and England. I asked Chairman Marlatt two or three years ago at Detroit what the Department could do to relieve our friendly neighbors--of bay trees and palms in Belgium--if we could start in this quarantine moderately to let our friends over there out. He answered me that nothing was done on the commercial side. He gave me that answer at Detroit. It seems to me these things can all be straightened out only on the side we are talking about, the letting in of these plants. We are not talking about insects and plant diseases. Let them show us, then burn them if necessary. As American business men we feel that there are many standard kinds of plants and bulbs long imported from well known sources abroad (and with no damage to our agriculture) which are needed here in quantities, should be brought in for immediate consumption, in addition to permits under bond to propagate and grow on the same.

I was told personally that a California importer took a blank permit and

brought in bulbs by the bushel. The permit stated they must be imported by quantity--by number. The man who sold them to him by the bushel told me so. I got this by word of mouth from two men and my word is good. How can an inspector under the Department go to California and check up stock brought in by the bushel? I have asked the Department how that can be done and received no reply. They admit spiraea. The Board handles them in five different ways.

First; Destroy the entire shipment.
Second; Allow the importer to cut them into quarters and wash them at their expense in Washington.
Third; Themselves, wash and divide the clumps.
Fourth; Division prior to shipment.
Fifth; Require others to cut clumps to single eyes.

Mr. -----? imported 3,000 clumps at a cost of around $60. I imported 2500 and it cost $268 and I sent a man from New York here.

These are little details but I am telling you something is rotten in Denmark.

MR. BURRAGE (President of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society and of the American Orchid Society; also Amateur Horticulturist); I had not expected to say anything in addition to what Mr. McFarland said but I am very glad to say for some of those present that we are grateful to you, Mr. Secretary, for broadening the scope of this hearing, contrary to the original form of notice, twice repeated. We are thankful also to Doctor Marlatt for his invitation of criticism. This morning he asked me if I wished to do the criticising. He said "Please do it as nicely as you can," so I will try to do it.

Mr. Secretary, a thought has come to me, listening to the remarks which have been made. I wonder why men of straw are set up by those who can throw them down so easily. Who has asked here for the repeal of the quarantine law? Who has asked that it be abolished? Who has asked that it be weakened? Who has asked for the importation of bulbs by Lady Pandora? We are here simply to per-

fect the law. I wish to say frankly I believe I have more respect for the law of 1912 than the members of the Federal Horticultural Board and I will try to prove it. From the beginning of this discussion, so far as I have had part in it, I have always favored the law of 1912 and I favored the quarantine. I speak not merely for myself in that but for the many thousands it is my privilege to represent here through the Massachusetts Horticultural Society and the Quarantine Committee which Mr. McFarland and I are members of, and for whom we speak, with Mrs. Crowninshield. I say that the Federal Horticultural Board has misunderstood the law of 1912. If this is to be a government of law and not of men there should be a reformation of the regulations of the Federal Horticultural Board so far as they relate to Quarantine 37. If it is to be a law of men and a Government of men and not of law, there is no need to change it. We charge the Federal Horticultural Board with a misapprehension of the law or a misinterpretation. We say that their acts show that the regulations they have prepared give them the power to be arbitrary, as they have been, to discriminate, as they have, and to substitute a bureaucracy for a democracy. We ask that that be changed. We ask that the people of this country be fairly treated. We know of nothing in the law that allows the Federal Horticultural Board to say I can import 1,000 Phalaenopsis from Manilla and someone else only 100. There is no law which allows me to import with their permission only six out of twelve lovely orchids from Canada where I have gone to see them and selected them. We know of no right for them to discriminate. If these plants have infestation or diseases which are injurious they should be thrown out. Those I represent believe in the quarantine. All this talk about the repeal of the quarantine or its weakening is absolutely unnecessary. Doctor Marlatt said, if I recall it rightly, that he wanted to have it perfected. Somebody else said it wanted upbuilding. We agree but that does not mean that it is necessary that the reg-

ulations should be worded and acted upon contrary to the law. I read in the paper this morning that the distinguished Solicitor General three days ago gave a brilliant address on the tendency of Congress to override the Constitution. The Federal Horticultural Board says they have acted with legal advice. I challenge them now to go to the Solicitor General of the United States and see if their regulations are in accord either with the spirit or the letter of the law of 1912 under which they act. We ask for certain things which we believe to be reasonable. We don't want to repeal the law. Personally I have suffered from the San Jose scale in California; from the corn borer, white pine blister rust, and gipsy moth in Massachusetts. I don't want any more of those. What has that to do with the discrimination of unauthorized power by the Board? A large portion of the discussion here today has been wholly uncalled for. What we ask is that those regulations shall be reasonable; that they shall be humane; that they shall accomplish the purpose of the law of 1912 and not the arbitrary bureaucratic doctrines of those who sit here in Washington. It has been said this should be called the Entomological Board and not Federal Horticultural Board. If it is a Federal Horticultural Board then I should say they should aid horticulture as well as protect it. Why should they discriminate against such educational institutions as the Arnold Arboretum and the Kew Gardens? Why should those institutions feel so hurt after all these years of wonderful upbuilding for this country? Why should this Board or the acts of the Federal Horticultural Board come out openly and show, as the Chairman has stated, practical discrimination against the amateurs of this country? Why should a man be ostracized so far as new plants are concerned just because he is a gentleman and has an estate and loves horticulture and loves floriculture and is willing to give time and money to turn out better things? Why should he be prohibited from importing those things that are rare? Who authorized the Federal Horticultural Board to

set up a tariff law? Congress did not do it. There was nothing in the report of the committee that reported the bill which said anything about tariff or protection. I judge the Federal Horticultural Board incorporated that without authority and I ask you, Mr. Secretary, to see whether that statement is right or wrong. Let me give you one illustration. I personally have no fault to find with the gentlemen of the Federal Horticultural Board. They have been exceedingly courteous to me. There is nothing I wanted which I have not obtained outside of half a dozen plants from Toronto. I have had far more than my share of orchids. I had occasion two years ago to learn of an old gentleman's estate in Belgium which was to be disposed of. He had a wonderful orchid (
and I sent for it among others and that importation came over very carefully packed. It had to go to Washington. It was packed so it would keep until it arrived in Boston, but on account of being obliged to go to Washington to be examined a considerable part of the shipment was lost, and one little plant with two little bulbs, no bigger than my hand, for which I paid some $600 because it received a first class certificate at the Royal Horticultural show in London--than which there is no finer known--was apparently killed, not by fumigation or any treatment done to it by or through the Federal Horticultural Board, but simply because it was so long in transit that the leaves came off. Fortunately the plant lived. At the end of two years it gave flower but others came up in the meantime and all my labor was lost to show the finest thing there was in that line in the world. I have a picture here showing the importation. I had another case of something like 1,000 orchids which came from Manilla through San Francisco. It had to be sent to Washington. Unfortunately it was late in the year and on account of the length of time it was frozen and I lost about half of the orchids. I find no fault because I took the risk. It was

not by a little Jew. Everyone did not do it. Then you believe in the reality of the wonderful lost reputed the bill which was speaking about Edith or Arthur. I think the Theosophical Society investigates this without authority and I ask you, Mr. Doughty, to not whether that statement is right or wrong. Let me give you one illustration. I personally have no doubt in the genuineness of the reported Spiritualistic Bunch. They have been wonderfully successful to me. There is nothing I would prize I have not obtained within of half a dozen places from Tuesday. I have had the same thing on Sunday. I had occasion two years ago to learn of an old gentleman's estate in Indiana which was to be disposed of. He had a wonderful cousin (and I said for it among others and that information was very particularly wrong. It had to go to Washington. It was pending so it would keep until it arrived in Boston, for we counsel of being obliged or go to Washington to conduct a proceeding just at the moment the last, was our little giant with the little bodies, no bigger than my hand, for which I paid some 1000 dollars it produced a first class certificate at the Legal Department above it Washington which that is in their handwriting exactly alike, and it proves to be any inaccuracy. Now he is my at Cincinnati the Psychic Spiritualistic Bunch, but simply because it was so long in transit that we have been sure. Fundamentally the same line. At the end of the year it was Cheer was about one in the morning and all my light was lost to say the Spirit Tuning fork for what time in the world. I have a picture here showing the impression. I had another case of something like 3,000 miles which came from Seattle through the Pneumatic. It was in the Spirit Photograph. Surprisingly it was done in the same and in spite of the length of time it was taken and I have never seen it or the original. I find on first moment I took it out. It was

late in the year and there is no criticism coming from me on the Federal Horticultural Board, but I only cite those cases to illustrate one of the three points I wish to make. We have asked and we ask you, Mr. Secretary, to provide ports of entry other than San Francisco. Washington is not a port of entry except theoretically. Why should we have plants come to Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, and then have them sent to Washington to cause great expense, delays, and losses? Why should there not be proper Government stations at the principal ports of entry both on the Atlantic and Pacific? So, Mr. Secretary, to finish, I ask in behalf of those I represent--there is nothing I want myself--I ask that we have ports of entry, that we be allowed to import through the Post Office subject to the inspection at the ports of entry, and that there be the aiding of the botanical and horticultural establishments--that they be aided by the Federal Horticultural Board and that this feeling of antagonism which now exists between them and this Department be done away with; and, finally, we ask that the principle or rule of discrimination against amateurs, except those like myself whom they have been good enough to pass, be done away with and that there shall be equal right. We know of no reason why one person should be preferred to another, or why there should be anything in the regulation which would give this Department the power to discriminate, and, therefore, we ask not for the repeal of the law of 1912 or the quarantine or regulations, but for revision of them in accordance with the necessities of the case.

MRS. F. B. Crowninshield Vice President of the Garden Clubs of America. Mr. Secretary, it is rather hard to speak as an amateur, but I want to say that I represent the Garden Clubs of America, composed of over 3,500 members and they only want to have slight modifications which you have heard from Mr. McFarland. And as to the nurserymen, they all like to sell things, and to whom do they sell them but amateurs; they are all very anxious to get our custom. We would like to have slight modifications in the importation of bulbs; reasonable inspection; and also ports of entry so there will not be the delay in having things killed. (APPLAUSE)

MR. McFARLAND: If I might have five minutes I could finish up our case.

DR. MARLATT: I thought the idea was to have both sides.

MR. McFARLAND: I wish to have something to say which I think would very much clarify the atmosphere.

DR. BALL: (Chairman) We have with us a number of very distinguished gentlemen from the foreign countries.

MR. McFARLAND: I presumed, Mr. Ball, that the hour of closing had almost arrived, and I had so little to say that I wanted to get rid of it.

DR. BALL: All right.

MR. McFARLAND: We have heard from ten states, and each one of them has had something to say concerning quarantine 37 and its application, and without exception, I believe they have all endorsed it unequivocally in all its parts. I question whether one single man who has spoken does really object to the things that the interests for which I have spoken ask. They are dealing with a different proposition. They are assuming that those who come here and venture to criticise the regulations under this quarantine are in position to do which has been clearly and repeatedly

stated not to be the case. I wish then therefore to reiterate that this Committee on horticultural quarantine does not oppose the law; it is not opposed to the quarantine; it asks for a revision in the direction of justice. It does not ask for one iota of relaxation of the efforts of the States to build walls around themselves; it does not even ask that Florida and California shall agree. California has itself absolutely sut in; you cannot get a plant in there but you can get tens of thousands of cases of oranges out. I do not wish to criticise that, but merely want to refer to the fact that the whole thing has been set up as having some relation to the proposition we made when it has no relation whatever. We are in hearty accord, in absolute andcomplete accord with everything and anything that the Federal Horticultural Board of the Department of Agriculture may do to properly keep out injurious insects and diseases from these States. Mr. Durand can have a quarantine in Florida, but what has that to do with the importation of scillas. These men have set themselves up to advance a thing which to be frank they do not know very much about except in its application to their own peculiar problems. Then, Mr. Chairman, if we accept that and we accept the absolutely selfish preventation of those who commerically profit, we have our case complete. We are satisfied to have submitted the items on which we ask amelioration. The whole question of the legality of the proposition will be discussed at another time, and I am very glad to acknowledge the courtesy and the attention that has been given to the case.

MR. JOSEPH MANDA: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very brief. I just want to supplement the splendid remarks made by Mr. Berge, and I am one of the same as the rest of them. We believe in upholding quarantine 37 but there are certain objectionable things that we have from the orchid growers standpoint. One of the biggest injustices that is done is regarding the bonding of the importers. I believe we should not be bonded like criminals. Why should we be bonded the same as a criminal. We have not broken any law. If we do then it is time for the Federal Horticultural Board to put us under bond. We strongly object to that because I import a few plants and I am under $5,000 bond. I made application the other day for a few more and the Board granted me the permit if I put up another bond. I had a ten thousand dollars bond, which would mean $15,000 that I was under bond. I now pay $150 a year for I cannot get a friend to go on my bond as a trustee and I have to get the bondingcompany. I wrote to the Federal Horticultural Board, Mr. Beattie, that it was outrageous that such bond should be required as for criminals, for first-class murderers and bank robbers, and I do not think we deserve to be classed in that class. It used to be that every man was innocent until he was proved to be guilty. Now, with the Federal Board, as far as we understand, we are all guilty until we are proved innocent. And we have some job to prove innocence before the Board with Dr. Marlatt as jury. I want to protest further to the unfair report and untruthful report of the orchid hearing that we had here some time ago, where if you turn to page 6 of that report:

Now, I will defy the Federal Horticultural Board or Dr. Marlatt that he can produce more than two men that spoke in favor of the quarantine at that hearing on February 20, 1921. Now, it is not fair to make reports like that to the Secretary of Agriculture, false statements. There were only two men there that spoke in favor; there were about 22 present. We strongly object to that on that point. As far as the quarantine is concerned, the application of the law, we are in sympathy with you, but we do object, and especially so in the orchid business, when we had this hearing in February, on the suggestion of Dr. Marlatt when he spoke before the American Florists at Detroit, we asked him if we could not come down and talk the matter over. Finally the meeting was arranged as stated in the report we came down, and I suppose we were nothing but a bunch of farmers and Dr. Marlatt made a big hole for us and we simply fell in there one after another. And the Board began to tell us whether we should grow hybrids or seedlings. Now, what right has the Board to tell us that; if the man is more successful with seedlings let him grow them; if he is more successful with hybrids let us grow them. That is not the spirit of the law as we interpret it, and I want to go on record for the orchid people; Mr._____ was to be present but unfortunately he was taken sick and I had to take his place at the last minute, and I have not had a chance to prepare any brief, but as I said we are perfectly in sympathy with the Federal Horticultural Board, and if we can assist them in any way as it was brought out here we want to do it. One of our members understood that there was an importation of

Dendrobiums Wardianum giganteum. He applied for the permit of the Federal Horticultural Board and they promptly refused it, stating that there was plenty of plants in the country; that Julius ~~Roehers~~ Roehrs had plenty of them, and I believe this man wrote, and the fact that they could not produce flowering-sized plants in the country, and defied the Board, and I think they are perfectly right. The Board tells them that we can not raise seedlings. I raised orchid seedlings thirty years ago. I think there are seedlings raised in this country and they are raised successfully, but how many seedlings are raised.

MR. MARLATT: You can ~~improve~~ import all you want to.

MR. MANDA: That's all right, but I have to put up a bond like a criminal. Why should I be bonded. If I violate any of your rules then it is time to punish me. Of course, the orchid runs into big money; it is not like six-cent bleedinghearts. If we import a few plants we would be bonded for more than our entire fund is worth.

DR. MARLATT: Of course, your affairs are in the permit office, and unless there is some special complaint the Board does not see it at all, but as I stated this morning we were compelled to place a bond because a great many people undertook to defraud or violate the quarantine, and we had to put on the bond much to our regret. It does not stamp you as a criminal at all. Some importers are doing a tremendous business, and they said to give them a maximum bond, men who are importing perhaps a hundred thousand dollars worth of material, and we said we would fix a maximum bond of ten thousand dollars. So you must have been giving the impression that you would do a lot of business. That would cancel the

[illegible] Shane [illegible] gigantesca. He applied for the permit of the [illegible] Board and they promptly refused it, stating that there was [illegible] in the country, and [illegible] I believe this was wrong, and the fact that they could not [illegible] [illegible]-sized plants in the country, and defied the Board, and I think they are perfectly right. The Board tells them that we can not raise [illegible]. I raised crystal seedlings thirty years ago. I think there are seedlings raised in this country and they are raised successfully. But many seedlings are raised.

MR. MORGAN: You can [illegible] all you want to.

MR. MORGAN: That is all right, but I have to put up a bond like a criminal. Why should I be bonded. If I violate any of your rules then it is time to punish me. Of course, the people run into big money in [illegible] like six-cent bloodhounds. If we import a few plants we [illegible] for more than our entire fund is worth.

MR. MORGAN: Of course, your efforts are in the permit office, and [illegible] in some special complaint the Board does not see it at all, and so I stated this morning as were compelled to place a bond because [illegible]

$5,000 bond.

MR. MANDA: It didn't according to the law.

DR. MARLATT: Then there is a misunderstanding.

MR. MANDA: No, there is no misunderstanding, but I think the bonding part of it is too e cessive because we have not broken any law.

DR. BALL: There is no insinuation at all that anybody had broken any law in asking for a bond. The Department of Agriculture is asking for bonds to warehouse men all over the United States. There is no suggestion at all. There never has been. We ask bonds in a dozen different lines of our work.

MR. MANDA: But of course they handle property and money, but we do not handle property or money. If we break a law it is time to punish us.

DOCTOR BALL: We have with us, as I stated before, a number of representatives of foreign Governments and they have requested that Mr. W. J. Lobjoit, the Comptroller of Horticulture of Great Britain, be their first speaker.

MR. LOBJOIT: I take it as a great compliment that you have accorded me the opportunity of presenting in public to the Government of the United States and at this meeting the case which my Government has sent me across the Atlantic especially to present in regard to this matter of quarantine.

We know perfectly well that there has been an unfortunate interchange of pests between America and Europe and between Europe and America. We have had from this side of the Atlantic the Phylloxera and the American gooseberry mildew. You have had from our side the pine blister rust and the brown-tail moth, and the San Jose scale from China, but these things occurred in the days before phytopathological science had been--may I say--initiated. In 1905 the United States had an act of Congress prohibiting the transportation of certain pests, but little action was taken thereunder. It was with the passage of your Plant Quarantine Act of August 20, 1912,--if one might say--the era of phytopathological science closed and you here--if I may say so--have the honor of introducing that era. Under that Act you took power to prohibit the importation of certain nursery stock except in accordance with conditions laid down by the Minister of Agriculture with the prescribed certificate of freedom from injurious insect pests and plant diseases. You obliged then an inspection of nurseries for stock shipped between October 1st and May 31st, and after that date required an inspection of the consignment at the time of packing. You did not require an inspection of all consignments at the time of packing until March, 1921. You were content until March, 1921, with an inspection of the nurseries during the growing time and with inspection of the consignment after the growing time.

MAJOR HALL. We have also, as I stated before, a number of representatives of foreign governments and they have requested that Mr. A. Lafferty, the representative of National Bank of Great Britain, be their first witness.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I take it as a great compliment that you have accorded me the opportunity of presenting my points to the Government of the United States and I also modifying the case which my Government has sent me answer the Attorney Generally to protest in regard to this matter of quotations.

We think particularly that there has been an unfortunate interchange of good-will in America and Europe and in Great Europe and America. We have had our ups and downs, and I think the Lafferty and the American presidency will-- [illegible] The Jews had from the side the Jews Balfour rule and the [illegible] and the Jews made from Britain, but there things operated in the days before electrotechnical science had been--my I say--instituted. In 1900 the Dutch Government had an act of Congress prohibiting the transportation of certain petroleum, but little notice was taken thereunder. It was with the passage of your Tariff Revenue Act of August 30, 1913,--if one might say--the era of physiochemical [illegible] closed and you have--if I may say so--done the honor of introducing [illegible]. Never that Act you took power to prohibit the importation of certain articles. [illegible] exempt in connection with quotations but been by the Minister of [illegible] with the prescribed certificate of freedom from injurious insects, pests and plant diseases. The original idea as imposition of duty was [illegible] between Another Act and my duty, and after that have required in [illegible] of our [illegible] in the case of [illegible]. The Act was passed in [illegible] of all [illegible] at the time of passing with Germany, 1923. The [illegible] with [illegible], and, with an importation of the measures during the [illegible] and with [illegible] of the development after the growing [illegible]

This act which gives these powers makes it perfectly clear what the United States Government is after by this act. It is to prevent the introduction into the United States of plant diseases and injurious insects new or not theretofore widely disseminated in the United States, and may I cite this as a subject which every country desiring to enter into trade relations with the United States must sympathise with and they must be willing to cooperate. I say that for my country frankly.

You took action under Section 7 of this act almost immediately--in September, 1912--and prohibited the introduction of potatoes from Great Britain, and all pines and all species of Ribes and Grossularia from Great Britain. But then in 1918 there came a complete change of policy--a new doctrine if I might so call it. Up to this time the doctrine was an open door of entry subject to inspection and certification, a limited certification of inspection of nurseries without the necessity of inspection of individual consignments. Now you enter upon quite a new policy--the policy of the closed door, subject to regulation and permit. In your report you say you believe that the policy of practical exclusion of all stock not absolutely essential to the horticultural, floricultural and forestry needs of the United States is the only one that will give adequate protection against additional introductions of dangerous plant diseases and insects, and as a part of this statement the Department points to the number of shipments since 1912--many from countries possessing good phytopathological services--from which dangerous diseases or pests have come. May I remind you that prior to this time you had not asked for the inspection of individual shipments excepting for only part of the year. And then you also found danger in the introduction of soil and you made the regulation prohibiting the importation of nursery stock containing soil. Then under Quarantine 37 you made a list of regulations, but the regulations admit lily bulbs, lily of the valley, narcissus,

hyacinths, tulips, and crocus. The critical mind wonders for what particular disease new or not hitherto widely prevalent in the United States you excluded iris, anemone, orchids, begonias and palms. And then you still did not ask for the inspection of individual consignments. Then came some of the amendments to the regulations. You made Regulation 14, which enables certain new varieties to be imported under permit and then you made the regulation--after the first of October you said you no longer accepted shipments which had not been inspected at the time of packing, and then you required the soil to be washed from all consignments of nursery stock.

Now, Sir, we have gone into that matter rather carefully because I want now to deal with this question of health certificates. At the request of the United States authorities, the English nurseries were inspected throughout the summer and after the 1st of October, and health certificates were given as prescribed by the American regulations and the certificate said that the particular consignment had been inspected and was found to be free from injurious plant diseases and dangerous insect pests. A little reflection on the part of anybody who understands the question will indicate that any consignment which received such certificate would also have other minor pests. The certificate would not say the consignment was free from every pest and every insect. It would say it was free from dangerous pests and injurious insects, but when we come to the category of intercepted pests we find that the certificate which had been given by us stating that the consignment was free from injurious plant diseases and dangerous insect pests was expected to cover freedom from all insect pests because the American system is so excellent that it gives us periodically a list of intercepted pests. It is claimed that out of 154 consignments we have sent 62 dangerous pests. The mere fact that our consignments had contained insect

pests and fungi is no indication, as claimed, that the English health certificate system has broken down, because we complied with the terms of the request, but it is evident that you here expected to find something quite different with our consignments.

If you will permit me I will make a short analysis of this list of pests which you say you found on our 154 consignments. The list, I admit, is a fearsome thing to look at. It contains names I certainly would not attempt to pronounce, but the pathological office of England has analyzed it and I am instructed to present to you this analysis.

These pests may be divided into three classes. The first and largest class comprises pests cosmopolitan in distribution and abundant in the U. S. A.

The second class comprises a very few species resident in Great Britain and not known to occur in the U. S. A., or only occurring in restricted places.

The third comprises species which are distributed by shipping and have no direct connection with the trade in live plants. Their presence must be regarded as purely accidental.

If I might be allowed to illustrate--I saw an insect crawling on the deck. When I was reading these notes an insect crawled over them. If there had been a consignment of British plants on board and these insects had crawled about they would have been categoried.

Of these classes, obviously No. 2 (species resident in Britain and non-resident in the United States) is by far the most important, but when this list is examined it will be found that three, comprising one beneficial species (Philonthus politus), one pest (Hepialus lupulinus) must have come in with soil and therefore must have been before the time you made the regulations. Another (Apion ulicis) is neutral and feeds only on a weed. A third (Apetela auricoma)

is distinctly an error as the insect is on the verge of extinction in Britain. A fourth (Emphytus cinctus) is a rose feeder of no importance and easy to control. It burrows into the dead end of the rose stalk and can be eliminated by that dead end being cut off before the stock is packed for shipment.

We claim this list, analyzed as I have done, does not prove that the English pathological service has broken down and that our certificates are of no value. On the other hand, it must be regarded as a triumph for the British inspection service.

Turning to the last species--cosmopolitan--it will be seen that the insects are such as not to make it possible for their introduction to have any effect on the pest situation in the United States. Apart from this, however, further importation can, by sufficient care, be almost wholly eliminated.

I would like to make one reference which especially concerns my country, and that is the safety due to our geographical position. We are a small island; therefore able easily to regulate our affairs, and Mr. Houston, writing in 1919, said that of all the European countries, England was the least to be feared.

Now, Sir, I want--if you will allow me--to go somewhat fully into the British Pathological Service. I want to prove, gentlemen, the value of the certificates we are able to offer you. Our service has, within very recent years, undergone a very great improvement. The Scientific Headquarters of the Service are situated at Harpenden, in a new Laboratory which has recently been acquired for the purpose. The Staff of the Laboratory comprises Mr. J. C. Fryer as Director, Mr. Cotton, Mycologist, with skilled technical and clerical staff to deal with all the wider problems of the subject. At the Ministry's Headquarters in London the Service is administered by a special staff of the Horticultural Division, while there are now attached to the Ministry 37 Inspectors, who are distributed throughout the country and who administer the various Plant Disease

Acts and Orders which are now in existence.

The Ministry have recently set up at Rothamsted a Phytopathological Institute to deal with fundamental problems relating to insects and fungi. This Institute is under the general Directorship of Dr. E. J. Russell; Dr. Brierley is head of the Mycological Section and Dr. A. D. Imms head of the Entomological.

The country has been divided into twelve agricultural provinces, in each of which is situated some noted Agricultural College or Experimental Station. Provision has been made for the attachment to each of these Colleges of a Mycologist and an Entomologist. These experts, though known as Advisers, are in reality Entomologist or Mycologist respectively to the province in which they are situated. Their function, though advisory to some extent, is in a larger degree one of Research and local investigation. It is their work, for instance, to test and elaborate under field conditions, the various conclusions which have been arrived at at the Research Institute at Rothamsted.

The various elements of this Service work together in complete cooperation. They have recently carried out a Plant Disease Survey of the entire country and are continually engaged in cooperative measures for reducing the damage done by plant pests. It will thus be seen that, under the general direction of the Ministry, there is in existence a staff consisting of about 40 trained entomologists and mycologists engaged in fighting plant pests and insects, while there are also 37 Inspectors, specially trained in their subject whose business it is to enforce the various legal measures now found necessary for preventing the spread of pests within the country. It can, therefore, fairly be claimed, not only that the English Phytopathological Service is in a satisfactory condition, but also that, both in its organization and in its personnel, it is in advance of that of most other countries in the world.

There should, therefore, be no grounds whatever for complaint on the part

of the United States to the end that Regulations, though scientifically safe, can not be carried out owing to the lack of sufficient scientific and trained staff.

Various orders have been issued by the Ministry for the control of plant diseases. The administration of these orders is entrusted to the Horticultural Division which is staffed by an Inspectorate specially trained in horticulture and pathology. The inspectors are stationed in the various counties of England and Wales for the purpose of seeing that proper hygienic and sanitary conditions are observed by growers throughout the country, and it is a pleasing feature to observe the improvement in the plant sanitation methods in nurseries and fruit gardens during the last few years.

We have recently passed a new order called the Destructive Insects and Pests Order of 1921 which confers on the Minister of Agriculture powers equal or similar to those possessed by the Federal Horticultural Board and the result of our system has been that throughout the country nurserymen are seeking to avail themselves of the inspection and are voluntarily asking for inspection and using the certificate of inspection as a fare of merchandise. Under this order the free entry of plants into England and Wales is allowed provided they are accompanied by a Health Certificate, issued after official inspection in the country of origin, to the effect that the plants are free from certain scheduled serious diseases, and healthy as regards pests in general. Provided the inspection is properly performed by experts in the exporting country, and the certificates conscientiously given, there is little fear of danger from the health of the plants, but the risks can be still further reduced if a second inspection takes place at the ports of the receiving country, and this double system of inspection is now in operation. The order has not been in operation sufficiently long to enable a precise estimate to be made of the risks involved, but it is clear from

the season's working that the safeguards taken have been effective in raising the standard of health of the imported plants without seriously interfering with normal trade. This method of safeguarding the plant industry has been adopted by most European countries without involving undue interference with trade conditions.

It can be fairly said that the proper perspective of the pathological problem as compared with the culture has been accepted by Britain, and proper provision made to secure that the health of the plants raised, not only for planting in the country but for export to other countries, may be regarded as reasonably safe. I have pointed out the improvement in our nurseries. Now I would like to refer to one fear that was expressed in Mr. Houston's letter which I just referred to, and that is the fear that while it may be quite possible that the United States has nothing to fear from the importation of plants or plant products grown in England or Wales, what guarantee is there that there will not be passed on to the United States some plants grown in other countries.

I am instructed to also guarantee that the English certificate will be given English grown plants only. I want to refer to the pests which you might really fear, existing in England and Wales. There is first of all the small narcissus fly and the eel worm, but these pests are also prevalent in the United States. There is further the fact that the diseases of bulbs can be eliminated by treatment by the Health Board. We send over large numbers of Manetti stocks. There are two diseases which they are subject to. I referred to one, the borer, which can be eliminated by cutting off the dead wood. The other is crown gall, which is, I believe, very common here. Americans, of course, are naturally anxious about our old diseases of potatoes. I am glad to say that we have now got the disease under control and the progress during the last year of two, of which I have a draft here, shows how our control has worked.

If she so desired America could now with safety take such potatoes from Great Britain as were certified to be immune and grown in clean districts. The American varieties of potatoes are evidently very indifferent croppers, as shown by the average yield of potatoes in America being about 3 tons to the acre. On the other hand the varieties of potatoes now grown in Britain have been steadily improving during recent years, and the average yield which is now over 6 tons per acre, is the highest of any country in the world. In closing her ports to English seed potatoes, America has struck a great blow at her own potato industry.

American pathologists must give the fullest consideration to such a serious disease as the SILVER LEAF OF PLUM, (Stereum purpureum). This is a really deadly disease which not only reduces the crop but ultimately kills the trees. It is a serious pest of a nature sufficiently deadly, in the absence of control measures, completely to destroy the whole plum growing industry. The fungus is known, however, to exist in Canada from Nova Scotia to Vancouver, while Hester and Whetzel in their "Manual of Fruit Diseases" state that it is known in the United States on Apples. The Ministry of Agriculture of England would support any reasonable measures taken by the Federal Horticultural Board to prevent the further spread of this disease. Many diseases, without being of the deadly nature of Silver leaf, do cause economic losses to the growers in Britain. The American Fruit Growing Industry is, however, not likely to suffer by the possible introduction of any of these pests from Britain for no plants are now exported on which diseases of importance would be carried.

The trade in RHODODENDRONS and ORCHIDS to the States is at present limited to that group for which importation can only be made in small quantities and then only by special permission. It is true that in the southern part of Britain the Rhododendrons are attacked by the Rhododendron Bug (Leptobrysa (Stephanitis) rhododendri, Horv.). Furthermore this would appear to be an American pest

which was introduced from that country into Europe. The position with regard to ORCHIDS perhaps is somewhat different. These are hot-house plants and subject to attack by the insects commonly found existing under such conditions. These insects are quite common the whole world over, and there would appear to be no single special pest of Orchids in this country which is not already resident in the glass-houses of the States; so that the risk involved by Orchid introduction has been exaggerated.

It is clear, from the letter of Mr. Houston that the American Government attach great importance to the further possible introduction of plants carrying the BROWN TAIL and the GIPSY MOTH. The risk of introduction on British grown plants is negligible for the Gipsy Moth has become extinct, and repeated attempts at re-introduction by misguided Entomologists have been completely unsuccessful. The Brown Tail Moth maintains a precarious existence on the southern and southeastern coasts of England, where it feeds chiefly upon Sea Buckthorn. It seldom, if ever, penetrates more than a mile from the coast, and the Ministry has no record of its discovery in any nursery. It may be mentioned that certain supposed records have been found to be erroneous, and based upon an incorrect identification due to the unfamiliarity of most English Entomologists with the pest.

(c) American Pests.

When the insect pests and plant diseases of America are considered by English Pathologists in relation to the class of produce which America sends Britain, the position is a particularly gloomy one, and it can confidently be claimed that England has at least as much to fear from America as America has from England. It is quite impossible within the limits of this paper to give a full account of the many dangerous pests known in America but absent in England. It will be sufficient to point to typical examples of the kind of pest which may be expected on American produce.

which has introduced from that country this country. The problem [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Fruit. ON pears and apples. Fireblight - perhaps the most deadly disease of the pear known throughout the world. Not only does it attack the pears but also apples, while its rapid spread in New Zealand on hawthorn hedges, the chief hedge plant of Britain, shows how difficult or even impossible it would be to control it in England were it ever established.

On apples. American apple pests are so many it is difficult to make a selection but as an instance the Apple Maggot (The Apple Fruit Fly) is typical of an insect which attacks the fruit; is most difficult to control, and would be a most undesirable addition to English pests. As a typical fungus Apple Blotch (Phyllosticta solitaria) attacks both the fruit and twigs and might well come over in the former. It might prove a very serious pest in Britain. The San Jose Scale has been found on apples landed from America. Four cases of Colorado Beetle are known to have occurred.

Seeds. On peas. The fungus causing Pea Anthrocnose (Colletotrichum pisi) is likely to arrive in the seed and is a damaging disease to be avoided if possible. American peas and beans are also attacked by certain Bruchus beetles not yet established in England and the American Bean Beetle (Bruchus obtectus) is specially undesirable being both a field and a store pest.

On Onions. The seed is known to carry Onion Smut and there is every reason to suppose that the isolated outbreaks of this destructive disease in Britain have been due to American seed. The further spread of the pest is being prevented under Onion Smut Order but the object will be defeated if America sends further infested consignments.

On clover. The Clover Seed Chalcid (Bruchophagus funebris) is unknown in Britain and its introduction might prove a serious menace to the English seed industry.

This list might be continued "ad nauseum" but the above will be sufficient to show why English farmers and fruit growers fear American produce and that

[illegible]. [illegible] – [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

their fear is fully justified on scientific grounds. It may even be admitted that English scientists are not satisfied that the present safeguards against the introduction of these pests in force in England are sufficiently stringent. It is impossible to predict as to whether the combined influence of the farming, fruit growing, and scientific interests will force the Government to adopt a more restrictive policy in regard to foreign pests. At present the view is that the pathological problem is not peculiar to the United States but is common to all civilized countries and is in fact one of the products of civilization. With the progress of civilization international trade was established and has now become an essential feature of the industry of the world. In the course of this international trade plants have been moved about the world from one country to another and though damage has been caused in some instances in the process the balance of evidence is heavily in favor of the beneficial effects. It is certain that both Britain and America have gained much through imported plants. Surely it can not be viewing matters in the right perspective to suggest that the whole course of trade which has been brought into operation in a natural way should be entirely stopped by imposing unnatural barriers. By such means progress would be delayed and industries suffer.

The continuance of trade between Britain and America and America and Britain should be the primary object to be kept in view, for each country is able in virtue of the different climates, to specialize in different classes of produce. It would appear a far wiser policy to take a broad view of the whole matter and one not narrowed down merely to a consideration of pathological problems; and to devise suitable ways and means for protecting against pests without imposing regulations which would tend to stop legitimate international trade. If the Health Certificate policy has not been as effective as was expected it may be that whilst the policy is right the system in operation can be improved upon;

if so, it should be possible for the Federal Horticultural Board to point out exactly the kind of Health certificates which are required with imported plants, and the inspection conditions to be observed. If this be done, an assurance could be given on behalf of England that the inspections would be strictly carried out and the certificates granted in a careful and conscientious manner. Furthermore if the Federal Horticultural Board is not able to accept the statements as to the improvement of the British Pathological Service in recent years, England would welcome a delegation from America to investigate the service first-hand and to work out a system for the certification of plants.

THE PATHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

Complete safety an unattainable ideal.

While it is true that the most important factor in carrying pests from one country to another is the trade in living plants, yet this trade is by no means the only factor. Many kinds of insects and also fungus spores are able to persist for periods, long or short as the case may be, away from their host plants and they are thus able to take advantage of any means of transport which may exist. Fungus spores may be and indeed must frequently be blown on board ship, while insects may fly on board or crawl into packing and thus be carried from one country to another. The frequency of such occurrences may be proved by looking up the records of foreign insects found in any market dealing in foreign produce.

Plant Quarantine, therefore, a means of reducing risks, not of eliminating them.

Since it is manifestly impossible to eliminate all risks, the problem resolves itself into one of weighing the risk of the introduction of foreign pests against the loss in trade due to quarantine measures of various degrees of stringency.

Prohibition demanded, but demand defeated.

Pathologists and Entomologists in England have for the last 10 years looked

with growing fear at the risks involved by the importation of American produce. They would prefer an absolute prohibition on the import of all American plants and temperate fruit. They have, however, been deterred by the certainty that such a prohibition, which it is logical to suppose would become operative on both sides of the Ocean, would involve a serious reduction in trade and that the premium the country would have to pay for additional security would be too great.

Prohibition again demanded.

Now, however, that America has declared herself to be aiming at the prohibition of all plant imports (in ordinary trade at all events) the above argument loses its force, and Pathologists are again asking themselves why England should continue to run risks without receiving any compensation by way of trade.

American importations unnecessary.

This argument, at all events as regards fruit, is a disappearing one, but in any case it is countered by a totally different consideration, viz., there are other countries from which can be obtained the categories of plants now imported from the U. S. A. and these countries have no prohibition on English exports. It is clearly preferable then, since risks must anyhow be taken, to deal with a country open to English trade rather than with one which will not risk English produce.

No valid argument against this policy.

A reduction in the number of countries sending potentially dangerous produce to England is, from the Pathological point of view, sound policy, since it enables Entomologists and Mycologists to recognize and guard against their risks more closely. Objection from the General Public would only arise if the reduction in the number of importing countries continued sufficiently to raise prices or to curtail the supply and, although such an occurrence seems most unlikely, it could always be met by issuing a special and temporary license to import from the prohibited country.

This policy not a reprisal.

There is no question of reprisals in this argument. A reprisal is the carrying out of something, in itself purposeless and undesirable, in order to compel another party to make a concession. Here we ask no concession and our action will stand on its own merits as desirable. We merely assert our rights to deal with our risks in the manner most advantageous to our country. It is, in fact, purely a business transaction in Pathology.

The conference was adjourned at 5:00 p. m. to meet again at 7:00 p. m.

EVENING SESSION, Monday, May 15, 1922.

The Secretary of Agriculture called the meeting to order.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: I understand that we heard from the representative from England just before adjournment. We would now be glad to hear from any of the representatives from Holland.

DR. van SLOGTEREN: As a Phytopathologist, or, as the growers call us, a "Plant Doctor," I will here enumerate some points which are of interest as well for the "Plant Doctors" as for the Plant growers.

Like a medical doctor takes the interests of his patients to heart, so also must the plant doctor watch the interests of his patients. This is what the plant growers particularly want and if, in spite of this there exists a friction between the Plant growers and Plant doctors, it can only be due to a misunderstanding.

That scientists have sometimes conflicting opinions you know too well, but this is furthering science more than harming it. At the present, however, it is of more interest to know what is the cause of the misunderstanding between growers and phytopathologists.

A plant doctor must give his assistance in a disease case of the plant, which is a combat between the interests of the plant and her enemy, and no matter how interesting and important this parasite may be for the plant doctor, he must realize that in this case the interests of the plant must come first, when he studies this process as a phytopathologist.

Often, however, phytopathology is in the hands of an entomologist or mykologist, whose interest goes more in the direction of the parasite than towards the plant. He is then easily inclined to attach too much weight to the parasite and considers the part which the plant plays in the disease process too much as a passive part, or even neglects it altogether.

It should, therefore, not amaze us when we phytopathologists sometimes do not arrive at the right aspects on the problems with our experiments and we should not blame the growers if they do not always show full confidence in our judgment, when we sometimes lack the fundamental knowledge of the conditions of life of the normal, healthy plant.

While the entomologist, mykologist, or Botanist each in his department, can obtain very important results in his researches, it is the phytopathologist who must study the relations and proportions between plant and parasites.

First of all I want to emphasize that I greatly admire the numerous and important scientific accomplishments of the American Scientists in the department of phytopathology as well as in all other branches of science, and if I criticize, I do so only to serve the advancement of international Phytopathology.

My field of activity brought me in close contact with the American view of control of plant diseases which finds expression in the Plant Quarantine Action, which through its radical measures has acquired a large economic importance.

This quarantine action the Federal Horticultural Board and the U. S. Department of Agriculture at Washington has stated repeatedly is founded on a purely scientific basis.

The motive for science and Scientific Research must be the search for truth.

There can be no American truth opposite to European truth, neither can there be European science opposite to an American science. Science is international, she knows no borders, and I therefore remain entirely upon my own dominion as a scientific man when I subject the scientific basis of the quarantine action to a closer examination and arrive at the conclusion that the methods adopted by the Federal Horticultural Board will be the finishing stroke to a sound international Phytopathological science.

These methods must, without doubt, lead to the raising of objections against

each others views, and instead of an international cooperation in the study and control of plant diseases, a sentiment is created to shut out the agricultural and horticultural products from each others countries.

It is difficult to say where this tendency would lead to, it is impossible to draw a line and the outlook seems to me from an economic as well as scientific standpoint, anything but elevating.

Prof. Westerdyk enumerated in a recent lecture a great number of plant parasites which are found in America and which can be brought into Europe on Agricultural and Horticultural products, where they are unknown up to the present time. This number could be greatly increased.

If, as a consequence of this fact every country in Europe were to arm itself with quarantine actions such as the Federal Horticultural Board has taken, the international attitude would become this, that every country must make itself independent of foreign supplies.

If these methods were to be generally adopted the aspect for the international cooperation and appreciation on scientific matters would become very gloomy and from an economic point of view, all countries, America included, which export important quantities of agricultural and horticultural products, would suffer greatly.

I would like to ask you what is a plant disease? And I must ask this question with particular emphasis, as in a lecture by the Chairman of the Federal Horticultural Board in defense of the plant quarantine, I read that a list of 3,000 dangerous insects had been compiled, and of a larger number of Fungi which all appear in European cultures and which might constitute a severe danger for American agriculture.

What do you imagine would remain of European agriculture and horticulture if all these parasites were dangerous or even partly so? This brings me back to

what I said about the one-sided conception of the phytopathology, which sees in every insect or in every Fungus which appears on a plant an economical danger.

It is your Dr. Beattie who rightly said: "We get hundreds of suspicious diseases and insects that turn out to be nothing," and if you consult the phytopathological literature of the last 20 years you will find that thousands of diseases which are described as dangerous parasites have never done any more harm to the cultures than that which existed in the imagination of the discoverer.

Science stands absolutely unprejudiced and knows moreover that it can never determine a thing for indefinite time. History has taught over and over again that the conclusions to which Scientific inquiries come at a given moment must only be regarded in the light of the facts known at that moment. Her sublime purpose remains to aim at the truth and she therefore gladly abandons a once accepted standpoint if newly discovered facts justify that course.

The classical examples in the history by which the old scientific bodies, which believed in their narrow minded own authority that they stood above science itself, and with curse and banishment tried to stop the large new discoveries, have sufficiently proven the truth of the foregoing.

It is therefore that I have read with great appreciation that the various restrictions embodied in the order are not necessarily final; also the communication of the Federal Horticultural Board that the rules of the Plant Quarantine Action are made in the full confidence that this was the best solution, but that they would gladly consider modifications in the rules if new and further information was produced.

One must not forget that the science is there not only for the study of the science itself, but that it must be practiced as applied science for the general benefit.

So the task of phytopathological science is to protect Agriculture and Hor-

ticulture of every country against foreign and domestic plant enemies by practical methods which take into consideration the claims of commerce as well as the claims of abstract science.

A true interpretation of the task of the modery phytopathologist is not the design of measures which will do away with the offending agents at all costs, regardless of the commercial considerations, but the new task is to harmonize the protective work of the scientist with the wealth producing activities of agriculture and horticulture, that the latter are continually advanced and improved.

On this basis it is of paramount importance that any measure for protection taken in this connection has due regard for the international application of such measure. If the basis of the international exchange in plant products is reasonable freedom from plant enemies, every basis, such as absolute quarantine against latent plant enemies, can not be justified from the point of view of the practical scientist.

It is without doubt a higher ideal for the applied science to overcome the difficulties of the cultivation by controlling the diseases, by the extermination of parasites, through the cultivation of disease resisting varieties and especially by introducing such methods of cultivation by which in the battle between plant and parasite, the first triumphs; than by searching for arguments for the exclusion and by seeking its strength in a strong isolation.

This is the reason why I, with hope for success, will try to give you an idea how we in our bulb cultures have taken the control of diseases in hand and what results we have obtained.

You will then see that the scientifically applied phytopathology can reach its purpose without being compelled to institute a plant exclusion.

The Dutch bulb growers offer the United States a product which has been grown

[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

scientifically, under expert care and supervision of the Netherlands Phytopathologists. The product is as free from plant diseases and insects as it is humanly possible to produce. It equals in cleanliness any agricultural products which the United States exports to Holland.

I do not wish to say that you will never find a soft bulb in a shipment, but that condition need not be due to a disease of the bulbs, just as little as the decaying process in a bruised apple is necessarily due to a disease of the apple.

It is difficult to picture to you here, how free from disease the Bulb stocks are in Holland. To get a full appreciation of this situation one should visit Holland and make personal observations, but I can tell you that I can show you many stocks of 500,000 and more Narcissus and Hyacinths of one variety in which not a single diseased plant can be found.

First of all a profitable cultivation is only possible if the stocks are kept scrupulously clean and free from disease, and this is for our bulb growing industry strictly necessary, before we aim at supplying a healthy product to the foreign buyer.

In order to continue to produce clean bulbs the stocks must be kept in a healthy state, so that the increase will be as prolific as possible and of strong vitality. Only such a condition can promise a final profit to the growers, as a very small percentage of the diseased plants is sufficient to take away the chance of profit.

The suppression of the few bulb diseases has been accomplished in a manner which I shall describe with a few words.

Take the eelworm disease about which you have heard from time to time. In the spring highly trained specialists go through the stocks looking for any infected plant which may appear. On sunny days these men are armed with umbrellas to obtain a neutral light on the plants before them. If the specialists find a

suspected plant he lifts it out of the ground with a large round borer which takes along the soil about the plant for a diameter of 6 to 8 inches.

The specialist places a marking stick near the spot where the plant has been taken out. The plant is examined by cutting the bulb open to ascertain whether the same is sound or attacked by disease. If in the latter condition a gang of working men is directed to the spot where this particular bulb has been found. They scoup out the surrounding bulbs and soil for a width of from one to two square feet, which soil is then carefully removed to a place where the parasites can not do any harm. This method makes both the soil and the stocks free from eelworm. To further combat the spread of this parasite the field in which a diseased plant has been found is turned to a depth of 2 to 3 feet in the fall and the planting stock of a variety in which symptoms of the disease have been discovered is subjected to a treatment in hot water which is so effective that not a single diseased plant can be found the following spring.

I brought with me various photographs showing details of these combative methods. (the photographs were passed around)

All these things go to show with what painstaking care the elimination of diseases in the bulb cultures takes place and our efforts have been crowned with such a success that in the large majority of stocks these methods need not be applied any more. The inspection is continued as a preventive measure but more than 99% of the stocks are as a whole now absolutely free from eelworm. The remaining one per cent of stocks which may be affected show the disease in a sporadic manner. A visit of any scientist will bear out the truth of this statement.

As an evidence of the good results obtained I submit photographs of very large stocks of bulbs of which I can personally guarantee you that not a single diseased bulb can be found in them. The owner of a stock of bulbs of several

millions recently offered ten dollars apiece for any diseased bulb that could be found in his stocks. Where I can offer you a scientifically verifiable guarantee of the absolute purity of such large stocks, it is difficult to believe that there are arguments which would justify the supposition that import restrictions should be placed on any whole class of bulbs I speak of. These bulb stocks are shipped from Holland entirely free from roots, topgrowth and soil. They are a thoroughly clean product and I request respectfully that all dry bulbs of all classes be permitted free entry into the United States, the same as they are allowed free entry into Holland.

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE: We will now be glad to hear from one of the representatives from Belgium.

MR. PYNAERT: Belgium is only a very small country but proportionately to its size, its horticultural interests are larger than in any other. A vast capital has been sunk in greenhouses and other buildings, and highly skilled labor is employed for the cultivation and propagation of our plants. Therefore, we have followed the course of events regarding horticulture in the United States and the measures taken by the Federal Horticultural Board with the keenest interest.

The present result of Quarantine 37 is that we are practically cut off from horticultural intercouse with the United States, and our once friendly relations have come to an end. We do not grown many rose stocks nor the bulbs that are permitted entry under special license and cannot benefit by the few exceptions made to this drastic ruling.

Last year about this time we had the pleasure of meeting you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Federal Horticultural Board, when we explained to you fully the workings of our Phytopathological service which we claim to be efficient and at present a perfect safeguard against the export from Belgium of all possible dangerous insects and pests. We shall be pleased to again submit these details to you if you so require.

We wish to state now as clearly as possible that it is our desire to collaborate with you and to consider any fresh methods of inspection or control that you may judge necessary in order to enable us to renew our former friendly, and to both countries profitable commercial intercouse in greenhouse plants and bulbs. This more especially, as before the Quarantine Act was passed it was your florists and buyers who gave the stimulus to our commercial enterprises and encouraged us to extend our cultures and increase the number of our greenhouses. It was on their insistance that we grew many varieties and forms of plants not wanted anywhere else.

We have been advised that the Board bears fully in mind the presentations made by the Belgian Delegation last May and that these would be taken into consideration at this Conference. We wish, therefore, to bring before the Board for its kind consideration the same propositions we made last year on behalf of the Syndicate des Horticulteurs Belge, viz:-

1. That plants grown under glass, such as Palms, Azaleas, Anaucarias, Aspedistras, Erascaenas, Orchids, Aroids, etc., also Bay Trees wintered in sheds, Begonia and Gloxinia bulbs, all of which do not carry any recognized pests and which can easily be disinfected and for which the soil used in growing has been artificially prepared and which up to the present time has shown no trace of infectious germs, may be imported subject to compliance with regulations as to inspection.

2. That an American official should be appointed to assist our Belgian Chief Inspector in his work of control, that he sould be attached to the American Consulate and all expenses supported by the Belgian plant exporters. We also wish to draw your special attention to the fact that last year you promised to give us a reply to the Begonia question and up to the present time we have received none. It is quite clear that these bulbs which are not affected by any

It remains to state now as clearly as possible that it is not easier to distinguish with you not to identify any fixed indices of independence or special form, but just necessary to claim to be ready to at least our Theory Friendly, and to look such a particular commercial interest to grandmaster plays and fully this more vigorously, or before the quantity but was passed it was your discussion and begins with your the absolute to our commercial enterprises but increase of to second the solution and increase the number of our principles. If our to study institutions that we some many variables and some of giving not social behavior also.

It has been argued that the Moral Bank Fully is that the principle mainly by the Muslim Sociologists have try and that these which be been the alternative of this Institution. In view, therefore, to make return the Moral to this considerable the same implications to such that year to study of the complete our Customers only, then:

1. That should prove close class, such as Tribe, Muslim, Communities, Multinational, Commerce, Public, Lodge, etc., also the trade relations in such region and climatic zones, all is which to not those our economical gain the right the majority of Christians and Jews. Well, the will need to provide for some multinational Muslim and which to be the general case the above to form of Institutions Prime, may be impossible, consider to employment via negotiation or of the question.

2. That as Muslims principal source is required to decide for Muslims Exact Industry in the world of Product, that to those be minutes to our Institution Muslim and its expense supported by the Muslim Joint Commerce. In view to form you Muslim principle to the Tribe Some Lead your Institution to the Prime Only, to the Muslim Institution and of to the Income Tax or Lodge Institution. It implies some that these Muslim Joint Any Muslim, or

recognized diseases can be imported without danger, the soil can be taken off and if necessary the bulbs cleaned and washed. Our growers are anxious to have a definite reply with regard to these bulbs.

BELGIAN PLANTS GROWN IN POTS CAN BE EASILY CONTROLLED.

None of the above mentioned Belgian plants carry any recognized pests dangerous to American agriculture and we are confident that from such restricted areas as those in which they are grown and under the present hygenic conditions you will not find anything new that is harmful to your forests, crops and countryside. It should not be overlooked that the plants for which we ask concessions are grown under totally different conditions from those of the tree nurseries and outside nursery stock. Plants grown under glass are continually subject to inspection and can at any time be controlled, almost at a glance, by any competent phytopathologist.

DANGER OF INFESTATION BY BELGIAN PLANTS IS NOT FOUNDED.

We would like to draw your attention to the fact that the few pests which have been noted on our greenhouse plants have but little economical importance. We therefore do not agree with you that you run any risk in importing large quantities of our Azaleas, Bay Trees, Palms, Araucarias and Begonias. This was confirmed by you yourself, Mr. Chairman, when you said: "I do not know of any very prominent injurious insects which affect the florists."

As regards the soil, we cannot admit that the soil in which we grow our palms and greenhouse stock can be the means of conveying dangerous insects and pests. The same is specially prepared and manipulated and is constantly under our supervision. Up to the present time nothing harmful and previously unknown in the States has been found in it and if any insects did accidentally get into the soil they would very soon perish from want of appropriate nourishment.

We know of no example of insects introduced by the soil which have attacked

any one of our greenhouse plants.

As to Azaleas, in the open only during a short part of the year every care is given to their culture; no weeds are allowed to grow under nor near them and in this way infection owing to the soil around their roots is out of the question; and as to Bay Trees, when ready for export they have been grown in tubs from three to five years and the balls are one mass of fibrous and tangled roots. If taken out of the tubs and shaken one finds that there is scarcely any soil left.

Therefore we contend that the measures prohibiting our plants grown in pots or tubs owing to the theory that the soil may be contaminated or contain hidden dangers, are based on hypotheses rather than real facts.

All this tends to show that through intensive control in all countries the danger of infestation could be done away with.

You know that in all countries which do business with the United States, legislation has been passed to meet the requirements of your Plant Quarantine Act, and that there have been appointed Chief and local officers of inspection to examine all horticultural products exported. The result of the Quarantine of the United States has become world-wide and it may be copied by other countries that think fit to take action against entry of your agricultural products. We might mention, however, that at the Conference held by the International Agricultural Institute of Rome, 1914, the conclusion of this Congress provided that the means of protection should consist of field inspections, regulations and health certificates as well as careful inspection of foreign plant shipments, and quarantines in case of heavy or particularly injurious infestations. At the conference held at the Hague by the ~~Int~~ International Horticultural Trade Federation on the 20th of April, 1922, this point of view has been confirmed by a resolution signed by all countries participating.

There was no question of any other kind and it allowed horticultural and

agricultural products to move fairly and freely to and from one country to another.

America has presented Europe with dangerous pests and there are probably more ready to invade the Old World. However, our phytopathological services are prepared to deal with them and protect our crops against these invaders but there has been up to the present no obstacle placed in the way of your products coming to us Belgians.

DANGER BY FRUIT IMPORTATION AND CALIFORNIAN PLANTS.

One wonders if even the total exclusion of plants would suffice to keep your country free from pests and if there is danger with some, there must also be with the twelve million odd plants that have come in under special permit during the last few years. These pests can be introduced not only as you claim in soil around our Azalea balls and in the pots with our Kentias, but also with all kinds of vegetable produce, animals and human beings and most especially with the fruit which comes in daily by shiploads from various parts. We have heard that one company alone possesses sixty ships for this purpose.

Bananas, we thing, are capable of carrying more dangerous pests than all our Belgian plants put together. What control is there on them? Certainly they are not brought to Washington to be dealt with as plants have to be.

Agains your cultures in the East can easily be infested with insects carried by plants grown in California. It is well known that the warmer the country where the plants are grown, the harder the battle to keep them free from insects and pests.

The transportation of soil around the roots of Californian palms may offer danger, because it is taken direct from the Mother soil.

BELGIAN RESTRICTIONS ARE INCIDENTAL AND NOT PROHIBITIVE.

On March the 1st of this year you issued a report referring to the liberality with which permits are issued and stated as follows: "the purpose of the De-

agricultural products to meet daily and family to and from our industry in matters

Marine- the greatest future with Independent people and turns the problem most

ready to invade the old world. However, our physiographical environ are ex-

posing to deal with sun and weather our people against their interest in their

can have by if the process as creature planet in the well of your problem-making

is on Britain.

SOME ACTUAL INFORMATION ON CALIFORNIA LIFE.

Do wonder if ever the total evaluation of plants grain matters to keep your

country free from pests and if there is danger with some, plants must also be with

the entire million odd plants that have come in under special permit during the

last six years. These pests can be intercepted not only on you obtain in port

around our Lakes but in the pole with our Marine, but also with all sorts

of vegetable produce, animals and human beings and most concerning with the fruit

which come in daily by mainlands from various ports. We have heard that one

employing three quarters sixty thing our this problem.

However, we think, are capable of employing more Inspector posts than all the

Eastern plants put together. Our country is from an Export Commission from

all States in Washington to be dealt with on plants have to be.

Under your authority in the last one month we intercepted with immense quantities

of plants grown in California. It is well known that we prevent the country

where the plants are grown, for instance the bulbs in Dutch Bulb from Holland

and pests.

The investigations of well known the years of California plant was ex-

tinct, however, it is known direct from the Eastern well.

MORAL MATTERS AS INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION.

On June the 1st of this year you issued a report matters in the Interna-

tig with which parents are later our states to million: "The passed of the Em-

partment under this quarantine is to provide for the entry of any necessary or useful plant in quantities sufficient to meet all reasonable needs."

In the same pamphlet you say "in contrast with this liberality of entry from Europe are the restrictions against entry of American plants." It has also been stated by you that for many years Europe has had an absolute embargo on all American plants and that if any American florists have succeeded in getting plants into France, Holland or Belgium in the last twenty years they have smuggled them in. In reply we wish to state that with regard to Belgium, the only restrictions are that the plants coming from the United States come under the rulings provided by the International Convention of Berne which provides that the plants should undergo an inspection for phylloxera. Any other information as regards Belgium is incorrect and there never has been any prohibition of American plants.

Indeed, within the last twenty years large consignments of young Kentias have been received from the States by DE RAEVE FRERES, and yearly VAN HOUTTE & TOEFFAERT of Ghent and SANDER OF BRUGES have imported large quantities of tuberoses and gladioli; also choice Orchids have come in freely and without hindrance. A few years ago apples coming from the United States had to undergo an inspection for fear of the San Jose scale, but this ruling concerning inspection has been cancelled sometime.

QUARANTINE 37 IS A PLANT EMBARGO

The Board has stated that the protection side of Quarantine 37 is accidental and incidental but that it is glad that the American florists are getting protection in their local production business enterprises, also definitely, that the United States can be sufficient for themselves and therefore should be put in an independent position. What does this mean? It means simply, Gentlemen, that though the idea was to protect the country against pests the manner in which the Quarantine Act has been applied has made it a prohibitive measure and it is clear

to us all that apart from its original object it is now intended to be a plant embargo. The result is the raising of prices to the general public and small fanciers.

Last year when we discussed with you the question of exporting to the States our Palms, Bay Trees, Azaleas, etc., you told us that we could only do so on the condition that the roots were washed clean of soil. This we had to admit was quite impossible from a commercial point of view. Now, however, in answer to a letter from one of our growers who applied to you for permission to introduce Aspedistras free of soil, you reply on April 6th, "I regret to advise you that the experts of the Department have decided that Aspedistra elatior, both the green and variegated forms, are already available in this country in adequate quantities to meet reasonable reproduction needs."

From this we cannot but gather the impression that besides your endeavors to keep out dangerous pests you have protective aims in view. If the leaves, rhizomes, and roots of Aspedistras be thoroughly washed, they must be perfectly immune from any dangerous organisms - why, therefore, should they be excluded? The Board asys no plants are absolutely barred from the United States - provision is made for the entry of any foreign plant that is desirable or necessary, any new thing that is discovered or created by foreign plant men, can be brought into the United States in sufficient quantity, not necessarily limited - 50,000 may be brought in if necessary or in sufficient quantities to establish that plant on a production basis in the States. Nothing on the face of the earth is excluded by this Quarantine except things that are barred by special quarantine, even those can be brought in under such safeguards as the Department may place about them, when it is necessary to bring them in. To prove all this, 6,000 permits have been issued, authorizing entry for over 29 million plants. This should indicate that the so-called "prohibited plants" are receiving at least some recognition from

the Federal Horticultural Board, but it only helps to a very small degree indeed, international commercial intercourse on which rests the progress and evolution of Horticulture. Allow us to repeat what we said last year, "Each country according to the conditions of climate, soil, labor, etc., has its special cultures which cannot be rivaled elsewhere, no country being absolutely self-supporting in all the various branches of Horticulture." Thus Belgium which has exceptional advantaged in many ways, imports Phoenix from the South of France, especially from Hyeres, because it is a well known fact that the plants from Spain, Portugal, and even of other parts of Southern France or Italy are inferior to those grown at Hyeres.

We are also dependent on France for Romain Hyacinths, which cannot be grown to perfection anywhere outside Ollicules and the surrounding district. Although the climatic conditions of Belgium are in almost every way similar to those of Holland, we cannot in our soil grow Hyacinths, Tulips, and other bulbs, as the Dutch do. On the other hand, they cannot by any means compete with us in the cultivation of Azaleas, Indica and Bay Trees.

In Belgium we are successful in growing Lilacs, Roses and Orchids for cut flowers. We are only too glad to import in the Winter season Mimosa, Violets, Roses, etc., of which the Belgian people are particularly fond, from the South of France.

In spite of numerous trials we cannot cultivate Lily of the Valley, which we still have to import from Germany, from where we also take seeds of flowers, grasses and vegetables, which do not mature in our damp climate.

On the other hand the Germans are not able with any measure of success to grow large or even middle sized Azaleas, and are anxious to again be able to rely on Belgium for their supply; neither can they grow Bay trees, and for these latter are entirely dependent on Belgium.

As for Orchids, they must from time to time inevitably be renewed by fresh imported plants, otherwise many species which cannot be raised and grown from seed will simply die out and be lost to cultivation. Amongst these may be mentioned Vandas, Oncidiums and Dendrobiums and Phalaenopsis, also the endless, fascinating and beautiful species of botanical orchids which form the foundation of nearly all the famous orchid collections, both with the amateurs and in the botanical gardens throughout the whole world. Orchid collectors travel in the tropics, maybe, to collect one known species of Orchid, but at the same time are on the lookout for anything unknown. What an interest it is for those who receive these importations; they eagerly await the flowering of any plants that look rare or uncommon. Many of the fine orchids of the present day have been introduced in this way, unknown to the collector himself, who did not see them in flower in their native land. Also, if orchid importations are not allowed to come in freely, there will be no more rare and beautiful varieties flowering among the imported species, as has been so often the case in the past; - one of the finest orchids ever seen is Cattleya gigas alba, which flowered for the first time in the States, and from which probably more fine hybrids are now being raised than from any other.

From information given us by the American growers, Azaleas will never be grown successfully into large plants and specimens in the United States; the same thing applies to Bay Trees; even if the trees would grow, have you the time to spend 12 to 15 years growing a Standard Bay with a head from two to two and a half feet in diameter, and 20 or more years before you can obtain anything like a big tree and 40 or 50 years for a fine specimen? It is out of the question, in a progressive country like America; you will never find these cultures profitable.

Carolina is the home of Tuberoses, from where for years past we have been

pleased to be able to import large quantities into Belgium, also American Gladiolus are the most esteemed in our country.

The home production of the United States will by no means be affected by the importation of Belgian ornamental plants grown under glass, because the needs of the United States are so great and the quantities that can be supplied by Belgium comparatively small. Even if all the plants grown by the Ghent and Bruges nurserymen were imported, it would not hinder the American growers. When the production of greenhouse plants in Flanders is compared to the requirements of the hundreds of thousands of plant lovers in the United States, what does it amount to - certainly nothing to be frightened at - as there would not be enough for a single one of your large cities, let alone the rest of the country.

We may add that plants cannot be compared with manufactured goods; it is nature, and natural conditions that are the principal factors in their successful cultivation.

When one special size of any particular ornamental plant is lacking, it takes years to make up the deficiency, or else one must try to procure them where they are to be found. Thus some years ago when seeds of Kentias did not germinate well with us we imported the seedlings from the United States.

This all goes to prove that we must depend upon each other if we wish to show our citizens the very finest and most beautiful plants and flowers.

INTERNATIONAL HORTICULTURAL RELATIONS WILL SOON BE CUT OFF.

One sees with us Bay Trees, Azaleas and Begonias growing to a degree of perfection that you never will attain under your climatic conditions and in your soil. This statement can, we feel sure, be corroborated by some of you gentlemen, whose visit we have had the pleasure of receiving lately. If the insects and pests that come in our plant importations are as destructive as they are pictured to be, how does the Board explain the luxuriant conditions of the countries from which the importations are made?

When one thinks of all the trouble we are put to and the expense incurred to keep our cultures as free from pests as is humanly possible, and as we think for all purposes sufficient, one cannot wonder that a strong feeling of astonishment arises amongst European growers at all the American restrictions against the importations of their produce, with the result that thoughts naturally arise to try to find means to countervene these, to our eyes, excessive measures of protection. Should we take a leaf out of your book and employ similar drastic rulings, is a question that may at any time be brought forward.

There has lately been considerable talk on this subject in the political as well as professional papers on both sides of the Atlantic. It cannot be wondered at if it is welcomed by Europeans and if they ask their respective Governments to take steps which may hamper the importation of American agricultural and horticultural products.

Belgian imports from the States are much greater than their exports. It only seems natural that Belgium should receive fair treatment and should be allowed to export as well as import horticultural and agricultural products. Do not lose sight of the fact that we are great buyers of American farm, field and orchard produce; we may also mention wheat, oats and corn. If we buy the apples, prunes, peaches, canned fruits, vegetables, etc., from the States, it is because you can produce them better and cheaper than we; for the same reason you should take those of our products that we have to offer you on the same terms.

We may say that the exaggerated fear of insect pests now being used to close the door to European plant products in order to give artificial stimulus to your growers hitherto unwilling to tackle these problems, constitutes a considerable danger to your export goods.

We might point out as an example of a possible consequence of protection, live cattle which before the war were prohibited entrance into Belgium, are now

admitted and arrive in large numbers. If, however, the Belgian authorities employed the same measures as the Federal Horticultural Board this important branch of American exportation would be stopped entirely.

SCIENCE IS A FAILURE IF IT HELPS TO KILL THE TRADE.

We are the first to appreciate the work done by the Federal Horticultural Board, inasmuch as it protects American crops and forests. Your scientific and economic researches increase the national agricultural products.

Such work satisfies the two principal conditions which science has to fulfill - understanding the secrets of nature and mastering them. But if it is not possible for scientists to detect the dangerous pests and they are not able to effectively control them in order to allow the free entrance of plants to a country where they find a ready market but have instead to resort to measures which, at least from a commercial point of view, amount to prohibition - this is a flagrant proof that at least in this case science has utterly failed.

QUARANTINE 37 IS AT PRESENT A DANGEROUS OBSTACLE TO INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE

Whatever value the economical and financial reasons, which certain States have, owing to the exeptional circumstances in which they find themselves, for creating and maintaining prohibitions and restrictions to importations and exportations, it is x thoroughly recognized that these measures constitute one of the most dangerous obstacles at the present time to international commerce.

It is therefore necessary to spare no pains to reduce them as far as possible.

There may be reasons to make exceptions to these principles, such as in the case of a monopolized commerce or when it concerns the vital needs of a nation, such as health, moral and public safety or the protection of animals and plants against epidemics and sicknesses to which they are liable. But whatever the motives of restriction used to importations and exportations, constituting a sys-

tem of protection liable only to some exceptions, they hinder international commerce.

The inconvenience should be reduced as far as possible, by such proceedings as will permit business men to determine the conditions under which these derogations should be made.

There is at present here in the States an important movement to promote international commerce. Happening to be at Philadelphia recently, we noticed that at the 9th National Foreign Trade Convention, amongst the questions to be discussed were those of finding the best means to expand the American foreign trade. It is evident that this must be based on reciprocity.

Therefore, in conclusion, it would be well that the importers and exporters of horticultural products of both countries should always be consulted, and that after due consideration, owing to the fact that Belgian plants are not liable to carry insects or pests of any kind, dangerous to American crops and forests, as might be the case from some less populated and not so well known countries and where the phytopathological service is not efficient as it is in Belgium; no one takes more care than we to have our plants free from insects. Therefore, for the reasons above mentioned, free entry should be granted to our Belgian plants under severe control on both sides and on the conditions as stated above.

DR. MARLATT: I am very sorry that the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to go away now and I think, if you will bear with me, I will act as the moderator and try to do it as well as he did and as well as I can with his manner and style.

I just wish to say a word in regard to a point raised by the last speaker. I think that if the speaker will look at the statement we issued he will find that Belgium is not included in the list of countries which have absolute prohibitions against American plants. The list we gave and which was never altered says such prohibitions have been made by Holland, France, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland; that restrictions in lesser degree were enforced by Belgium, Italy, Spain, Turkey, and Russia. The actual quotation of the Belgian law is taken from a copy of a direct translation furnished us by the Belgian Government, and you will find that the restrictions, while not amounting at all to an embargo, are still quite onerous.

This discussion is taking up a great deal of time. We realize these people from abroad have come a long way and we are glad to extend to them every courtesy and are glad to hear from them but I hope they will realize there are many who have come a long distance in this country and will have mercy on us. If there are others from Holland we would like to hear from them, and I hope they will bear in mind my statement.

DR. VAN POETEREN: As Chief of the Phytopathological Service of the Netherlands, I have for several years been in charge of the scientifical and practical execution of the Phytopathological Survey in Holland, including the inspection and certification of all plants destined for export.

This put me in close touch with the rules and regulations, governing the plant import in the different countries, including the United States.

I thank you for this opportunity afforded me, to say something about the

Dr. CHALLEY: I am very sorry that the Secretary of Agriculture thinks it unnecessary to go away now and I think, if you will bear with me, I will not on the substance but try to do it as well as he is and as well as I can with his manner and style.

I just wish to say a word in regard to a point raised by the last speaker. I think that if the question will look at the statement we issued he will find that Belgium is not included in the list of countries which have absolutely prohibitive general tariffs. The list we gave was one which was fairly balanced. Some such prohibitive tariffs have been made by Poland, France, Germany, Australia, and Switzerland, but restrictions in other respects vary different by Belgium, Italy, Spain, Norway, and Sweden. The general provisions of the Belgian law in essence form a copy of a Bonner Reparations formulated as by the Belgian Government, and you will find that the restrictions, which are remaining, it will be necessary, we feel, with them.

This discussion is taking up a great deal of time. We realize that people from abroad have come a long way and we are glad to extend to them every courtesy during our stay and glad to hear from them but I hope they will realize there are many who have been a long distance to this country and will have going to do. It has been our object from Poland to work like one from Poland, and I hope that will have in mind my statement.

Dr. DE FRANCQUI: In later of the Agricultural Section of the Chamber, I have the general power from it member of the Belgian Parliament and President of the Agricultural Survey in Belgium, including the Ministry of Agriculture and Industrialists of all sorts desired for report.

Allow you me to close with the plan our regulations, according the plan issued by the different committee, including the United States.

I thank you for the kind expression which had my, in my speaking about the

phytopathological requirements for plant traffic and will use this for making some observations on Quarantine 37.

The way in which the Quarantine Act of the U. S. is executed since June 1919 is in my opinion not in accord with the phytopathological science of today, for, while this act, according to its text and the motives governing its adoption intends to maintain the importation of plants, with restrictions in case of danger for introduction of noxious insects and plant diseases, the application consists chiefly in exclusion with limited admissions, when according to the opinions of those who execute the act, there is a need for these plants for horticultural economical reasons.

When I put forward the question, whether the policy now adopted by the Federal Horticultural Board is justified by phytopathological reasons, I must answer that there are no such reasons.

For there certainly is a way, to execute such an act in accordance with its spirit.

As a reliable way to improve the present control, I suggest that besides inspection and disinfection both in the fields and at time of shipping, also be added thorough control from the s tart of cultivation until packing, thereby also paying due attention to the surroundings and the soil of the localities where the plants are grown, and instituting a close cooperation between the growers and exporters on one side, and the phytopathological service on the other side and only admitting to exportation those who live up to all required regulations.

If it should be impossible to execute this quarantine act, according to its spirit, and if really the phytopathological science required the present system of exclusion, then this would not only be a strictly American affair, but would involve a scientific question of the entire world.

For what applies to the United States would then also apply to all other

psychophysiological requirements for plant growth and will not then dry rather than distribution the Constitution Ch.

The way in which the Convention dit ed for f. f. is remarkably clear. This is by my opinion due to another via the physiological values of index, for, while this may, according to the law and the mutual convening fr.alis-tic behavior to emphasize the importance of plants, with emphasis in view of longer for Convention of workers Lincoln and plant climate, the equivalent complete reality to continue with Lincoln absolutely, when morbidity to the difficulty of those who assess the act. There is a need for those plants the institutional assessment needed.

Once I try through the question, whether the policy now adopted by the Federal Institutions tend to provide by physiophysiological measure. I need answer that there are no such measure.

Any close materially in a way, to educate and to act to experience with the right.

In a reliable way to improve the general country, I believe that better temperature and distinction must be the "Ch.Ch" of step of eligibility, also be small Commerce service from the areas of publication until position. Convey also psychos and objective by the environmental and the well of the Institution there are plants are green, and instituting a state employing patterns the growth of employing to our city, the Ch. physiophysiological further of the above cls and only qualitative to supertaking people who live up to all medical requirements.

If it should be Impossible to examine this Convention and, according to its ability, and if really the physiophysiological problem employing the general experience of Commerce, some time will not only be a clinical Commerce Ch.Ch, the great interest a physiological question of the action Ch.Ch.

The one, applied to the notary Commerce should take this right to all other

countries and all those countries should then have to follow the example of America.

It cannot be denied that plant diseases and insects are transported from one country to another, and in some cases we know that this has been done by plants. The United States can point out some examples, but Europe can do so also. But the fear for the thus imported organisms, must not be exaggerated. The number of cases in which these organisms have developed themselves into parasites of more than local importance is not large.

The Federal Horticultural Board has published lists of insects and pests collected from imported plants. The contents of these lists give reason to severe objections, for, as I find these lists for the greater part occupied by Oyster Shell Scale, Psylla Buxi, Leptobursa explanata, and other insects of no importance.

As I find the names of predaceous beetles, like Carabus nemoralis, and others,

as there is put on the name of Aphodius, a beetle that lives in manure; further fungi that only live on decaying leaves,

It is evident, that these lists are only scientific inventory of the gathered facts, while they give to the unscientific people an alarming impression of the dangers involved by them.

While discussing this subject with the members of the Federal Horticultural Board, they admitted that the greater majority of these were already widely prevalent in the United States, while others were harmless or even useful.

The control of plant diseases has always been for Holland a matter of great importance, due to the fact that Holland is an exceptionally important horticultural country.

This led to regulations, issued by the Government as well as by the Counties and the Townships in which are situated the important centers of horticulture, while also the trade organizations give their full assistance by the enforcement of the regulations.

The Netherlands Phytopathological Service, which, with an efficient staff of officers has been steadily improved since its foundation in 1899, is able to control to a high degree the plant pests which appear in Holland. It has in all the centers of horticulture and agriculture, scientifically and practically trained officers, who devote their entire time to this profession.

We have effectively defeated American Gooseberry Mildew and other diseases and insects which we managed to combat through our approved methods.

The advancement of Phytopathological Science has so thoroughly changed the attitude of the Holland Government itself, that the law enacted in 1898 for the prevention of the spread of the San Jose Scale, excluding all woody plants from the United States is annulled and substituted by regulations allowing the entry of plants from the United States under safeguard of inspection and certificates.

It is our hope that America, along the same lines and for the same reasons, will return to the original intention of the Quarantine act, which means to regulate the importation of horticultural products by inspection and certification.

If the principle, which now governs the application of the Quarantine act, should be adopted by other countries, the whole world trade of agricultural and horticultural products, not only of plants, but of fruits, beans, seeds, etc., as well would then be rendered impossible or be put under restraint in such a way that it would be practically impossible.

That the events may move in that direction is being felt in wide circles in Europe as was disclosed at an International Horticultural Congress held at the

Hague last month, where delegates from Great Britain, France, Belgium and Holland were present.

Without entering into details, I state that Europe runs the same risks in importing American diseases as America does from European diseases for there are many diseases of which the American strains are much more virulent and also much more dangerous than the European ones. And many other diseases, beetles, scales, and other insect pests, new to the European countries could be of great danger when introduced.

Prof. Joh. Westerdijk of Holland has also pointed this out in a lecture at the Hague and I approve of this completely.

I am however convinced that the close cooperation between the Phytopathological Services, combined with the progress of Phytopathological Science gives ample guarantee to limit this danger to such a degree, that plant exclusion on scientific grounds is not justified.

And then, all drastic measures, theoretically so charming, are altogether insufficient because the real plant parasites follow many times quite other ways than by plant imports when going from one country to another. Sometimes these ways are entirely unknown, in other cases it is quite certain, that plants have nothing to do with their transmission.

This for instance has been ascertained in several cases with the Colorado Beetle that has been brought over to Europe, without the plant on which it lives.

In consequence of the foregoing, I request that the importation of horticultural and agricultural produce from countries which maintain a phytopathological service acknowledged by the importing country, will be mutually accepted if accompanied by a health certificate issued by the duly authorized official of the exporting country, acknowledging the right of reinspection at place of destina-

tion. The certificates to be drawn up in such a way that the guarantees given therein can be complied with; provided that the restrictions on importations should be limited to cases of special diseases and remaining in force only so long as the combating of the diseases requires, and only concerning shipments from infested areas.

DR. MARLATT: I have a note here from the "jury" appointed by the Secretary suggesting that if any more papers of considerable length are to be presented that the author give a summary of the paper and submit the paper for the consideration of the "jury" and Board and Department. They think it will save time. In fact I don't know of any others. Mr. Louis Sander of Belgium is, I believe the last representative who has asked for a hearing.

MR. SANDER: The President of our Belgium Horticulture Chamber stated our case for us and I have nothing more to say except I should like to add that we have come over here to try and arrange for the importation of our bay trees, palms, azaleas and also begonia bulbs, and we should be pleased to enter into any details you may require about this. As to the begonia question, last year you promised us a reply if we could be allowed to send you begonias. To the present we have not had this and we ask you to kindly let us know now if you will admit these tuberous begonias and gloxinias. The gentleman--Mr. Vaughan--said I think that about 30,000 buyers were waiting for them. I trust these buyers will be satisfied. It seems to us, after hearing about the pests invading the States that perhaps you have rather lost sight of the fact that our system of inspection in Europe has been perfected in the last few years and that at present you do not run the same risk you did in the old days. Progress has been made in this branch as in others, and if there is any fault to find it is not that we are old-fashioned but that you are prone to make changes. Also, azaleas

are not likely to be harmful to the orange groves of the Southern States. We ask you not to make one sweeping rule and put all our plants on the same footing. We think none of you can feel we are asking impossibilities, but simply what is fair and right and to our mutual advantage. We only ask that you treat us as we should be treated; to accept our inspection as we accept yours; to use quarantine measures only when they are necessary and at a time when there is a real danger of infection; and, in the meantime, to lift this quarantine and allow free entry to our plants subject to inspection.

MR. HILL: I would like to ask Dr. Marlatt his attitude in regard to providing a port of entry for plants at the city of New York for examination, to be passed on there instead of having to have the plants come down here to Washington and then sent on to their destination and consigned. Then another matter that came up, and I do not know whether the Federal Board took this into consideration or not. There are a great number of soft plants, take Geraniums, Carnations and crysanthemums, the young plants in the spring of the year that we cannot hope to get through with the soil washed from the roots. Now, it has been tried, and there has been serious loss occasioned by trying to get the plants in as I understand in that manner. I cannot understand why when these plants arrive at Washington, if they happen to come here, why you cannot wash the soil off the roots, put them in fresh moss and start them on to their destination. It seems to me that this is a matter that could be adjusted and attended to without loss to the soft-wooded plants, Now another thing, you take the question of novelty roses, new introduction. They are generally put on the market in the month of June, the young stuff, plants perhaps 15 to 18 inches or may be two feet high, to demade those plants of their soil means death to them. Then we have to wait until the fall of the year before we can get those plants in. Now, it does seem to me that arrangements could be made, a modifications of the order so we could get those plants through without their loss, as would be under the present order of the Federal Board.

DR. MARLATT: What plants do you have in mind beside chrysanthemums.

MR. HILL: You have geraniums, for instance, there are quite a number of growers of geraniums in this country or helitropes or soft-wooded plants and these plants perish on the way over if they are expected to come through with the soil off the roots, and it does seem to me if they have to come to Washington they could come here with the soil around their roots, and if you are afraid of contamination from that soil why can't you wash them off and start them on to their destination. That is a suggestion and I believe it is practicel.

DR. MARLATT: Taking your uestions in the reverse order, I think your suggestion is one that is worth considering and it is one we would be very glad to consider. Of Course, it would have to have certain limitations on it on account of quantity of soil that might be brought in and the quantity of soil that would have to be handled. In other words, we would have to have a limitation on the plants that would be subject to such amendment. It would require a certain amount of labor and cost and if the importer would be willing to pay for that labor cost I think it would be some thing that would be well worth consideration by the Board and by the experts of the Department with a committee of you gentlemen. The matter of the port of entry at New York has already been discussed by Mr. Beatt e who pointed out the difficulties. So far as the Board's attitude toward that is concerned we have always been in favor of it, as you know. I mean we have always said, and it has been published many times that the Board was perfectly willing to establish inspection ports

at principal ports of entry. I think New York would take care of it in the east, if we had money to do it, but it would cost a good deal of money, and Congress has not given us the money, and you gentlemen have not endeavored to stir up your representatives in Congress to get it to us. We are prohibited by law to even made much a suggestion as I have made, so you can consider that unsaid, but you may get the hint. Now, aside from the objections which Mr. Beattie made, that is you would have a lot of transfer additional to what you have now in New York City; you would have the loss of all the wonderful assemblage of experts that we have here in Washington, that is plant specialists, greenhouse men and all that sort of thing to take good care of your plants; you would have a tremendous loss between places as Mr. Beattie explained. We are perfectly willing to try it, however, it is not a matter of intention on our part, but we have not the money to do it. We have one at San Francisco, but very little comes through San Francisco so a very modest force can take charge of that, but here in Washington we have one force and it takes a good many men to examine the large number of these shipments that come in. To establish an inspection service in New York would mean first the finding of men because we would have to maintain a large part of our force here, but a great many of the importations wouldcoome through here and we would have to duplicate them for New York City and it would require the finding and training of these men. It is estimated that $50,000 a year would cover it with the rentals and so on, certainly not much less than that, and whether you would be any better off would remain to be seen but if we had the money we would be glad to do it.

of prehistoric parts of entry. I think New York would take care of it in the court, if we had money to do it, but it would cost a good deal of money. Congress has not given us the money, and you gentlemen have not endeavored to stir up your representatives in Congress to get it so. We are prohibited by law if we ever made such a suggestion as I have made, so you can consider that unmade, but you may get the blame made from the objections which Mr. Beattie made, that in you would have a lot of transfer additional to what you have now in New York City; you would have the loss of all the wonderful assemblages of exports that we have here in Washington, that is plant specialists, greenhouses and all that sort of thing to take good care of your plants; you would have a tremendous loss between places as Mr. Beattie explained. We are perfectly willing to try it, however, it is not a matter of indication on our part, but we have not the money to do it. We have one at San Francisco, but very little comes through Mr. Francisco as a very modest fund for this charge of that, but here in Washington we have one force and it takes a good deal more to promote the large number of these gentlemen from the. To establish an inspection service in New York would mean fifty the fifty or ten thousand we would have to allow a large part of our time here, but a great deal of the importations would come through New York we would have to duplicate them the New York City and it would mean the fifteen or ten thousand of these men. It is estimated that it would cost a very small sum if all the [illegible] Such time that another [illegible] would be the [illegible] to do it.

MR. J. R. MUDY:. It was remarkable to hear the English speaker tonight state that you had no gypsy moth and practically none of the brown-tail moth in England after two hundred years of importation into England of the polished bulb, the dirt-free Holland bulb. Now, I am wondering if in the study by the Board with respect to bulbs it has developed that the other clean-dirt free bulbs may be also be hoped to be as leniently handled, that is the Iris, the Snowdrop; and the Scilla. I just suggest that because it was spoken of today.

DR. MARLATT: I think there is very little difference in the danger between one bulb and another. It was not the matter of danger that caused the experts of the Department to pick out a certain list of bulbs and exclude other bulbs. The reason for such selection as I am advised was one largely based on availability, or on the early prospect of the availability. In other words, the principle of the quarantine which has been so often stated was that it seemed desirable to reduce importations and the necessities to keep out pests. That is, things that were not necessary were excluded, that they were already available or could easily be made so. If they have made an error on that point it can be corrected. If these bulbs are not available and are not likely to be there is no reason they could not be added to the list. As a matter of danger that is another step. A great many things may come in on bulbs; some things have come in on bulbs. For instance, the bulbs from Holland have taken into the Northwest a soil worm which has not confined itself to the bulb, but has gone to the clover and now threatens the existence of the great forage crop in the Northwest, and is now spreading to the point of infestation.

There are dangers with bulbs, some of these bulbs have diseases; we may not have those diseases among our own bulbs; we may want to exclude them, but unfortunately the pests that may be brought in with these bulbs do not confine themselves to the plants they come over with.

MR. WALLACE R. PIERSON: I would like to ask Dr. Marlatt if there is cooperation between the State entomologists and the Federal Horticultural Board, how they act, whether they act in harmony in case of an infestation, for instance, the moth that is now crossing the line from Connecticut into Maine, whether the control of such a thing as that is directly under the supervision of the Federal Board or whether it is left to the hands of the State authorities to rule against them, and whether the State quarantine takes precedence over the Federal quarantine or whether the Federal quarantine can regulate interstate commerce. I would be very glad to have some information on that subject.

DR. MARLATT: You have asked a pretty large question for a late hour of the evening. There is very hearty cooperation between the federal Government and all of the interests in all quarantine work. The interstate movement of plants in interstate traffic is under Federal control, if the Federal government wants to take control. The State, however, can control things that come into the State. It cannot control the traffic; it cannot prevent things moving in interstate traffic. When they get into a state they can control, but in all these matters there is very close cooperation. In all of our quarantine it is not foreign; it is domestic; it is not up really for discussion at all, but our quarantines govern only interstate movement. We have no control whatso-

ever within a State. Hence if we get any control of any such a problem it must be a combination of the two powers, - State and Federal. I would like to have you consult with our experts on that. If you will come down to the Bureau of Entomology and ask for Mr. Snyder he can tell you all that is known about it.

DR. MARLATT: That completes the list of foreign delegates who have indicated a desire to speak. If there are any other delegates from any country not listed here, we would be glad to hear them now, and if not the field is open. There are a great many people here who have not spoken and who may wish to, and some of you who have spoken may wish to speak again.

I have some notes which I wish to take up in the way of explanation and correction of certain misapprehensions. I will say this, however, right now, that a great deal of this discussion has had relation to bulbs and it has taken the form of a feeling that the Board and Department represent a stone wall on that subject. I think if you will read that statement I gave you this morning--I don't know that I covered it in my remarks today--you will find (on page 6) that I announced at that meeting in Detroit three years ago that if there was one weak point in the quarantine it was the subject of bulbs and that the Board was perfectly willing to consider recommendations on the subject of bulbs, and that if the bulb people of this country represented at that conference--at which I believe there were some 1500 delegates--would get together, study the matter among themselves, and come to the Board or Department, they would be given very careful consideration. The Board did not make that list. It was made by the experts. The Board is willing to have it revised in any direction. It is subject to correction. We are still waiting for that body to come to us and make constructive suggestions, and we will have to get down to constructive suggestions pretty soon or we will waste all our time. I think I will announce now a proposition that has come to my mind. We are exposing our points of view now and it is all worth while, but ultimately we have got to get down to constructive work--to determinations of just what things should be added to Regulation 3, just what classes of bulbs or other plants; or what classes, if any, should be taken

Mr. Gladstone: What would have been the effect of a similar delegation from Dublin? Would it have been a good thing? It would not have been any thing of the kind. It would have been a most dangerous thing and entirely not liked here, we would be glad to have them over, and if not the Irish it would be some thing else or a great many people. Even the Irish Parliament would not be in favor of it, and even the Irish Party would not wish to repeat such a thing.

I have been asked which I think is the way of the way of negotiation and negotiation of certain arrangements. I will say fairly, however, right now, that I doubt if any thing of the kind would be right and it has been the case of a little with the Irish Parliament suggested a three well or four months. I think it you will read that statement I gave you this morning—I don't know that I anything it to my remarks today—you will find (in fact I remember) that anything in Ireland there was not if there was any equal point in the question if was the subject of talk and that the Irish may effective utility in regular representation on the subject of Dublin, and that it has full people of a very strong representation in that neighborhood—I mean I mean there were some 1000 delegates—would get together, study the matter some commission, and come to the Board of Guardians, they would be given the matter consideration. The Board did not make that list. It was made by the Parliament. The Board is willing to have it referred in any direction. It is good commission. We are willing for that body to come to us and make some arrangements, and we will have to get them to particularize some plans for we will meet all our plans. I think I will mention one point in my mind. We are suggesting the payment of rent for the land in all Irish Dublin. Yet strangely we have not at any time in negotiation—in negotiations of late years—things should be found at Dublin or Irish Parliament. If any Board of Guardians or Irish Parliament or Home Commission, or any Board of Irish

away sometime in the future, not immediately.

That is all based on the theory that Quarantine 37 is going to stay and that it is legally correct. Of course, if it is overthrown and is not legally authorized, that is another matter. It has been decided for us by our legal authorities. If they have made a mistake it can be corrected. Taking the theory that it is going to stand and that we want to correct it in those details where it should be corrected, we have got to get down to constructive work and I would suggest--and it is only a suggestion--that the florists appoint a committee to consider the subject of bulbs, the very thing I suggested three years ago at Detroit--bring the foreign gentlemen into it if they wish. We will sit with them if they like. We will consider this subject of bulbs. We have an open mind on this subject. If any of these bulbs are not produced or being produced in the United States and can not be produced in the United States, and can be safely introduced--as very likely they can--we will give that very serious consideration and no doubt make some changes.

I would make the same suggestion to the nurserymen. The nurserymen have endorsed the quarantine as a body. They have asked this morning, as I recall it, for only one thing--certain lining out stock of Norway maples. We discussed that with a group of them sometime back, but we are willing to open the subject again. It is not closed. If they will nominate a good representative committee and come before us we are willing to consider it. We issued a circular long since which was circulated throughout the country to the effect that if any plant like the Norway maple could not be produced from seed in this country, which could be collected or imported to this country, and if it was necessary to get young stock, it was a subject properly to be presented to the Board for consideration. That was a public announcement. It went out as a circular letter a year or two ago.

I think, as the time is getting very late--it is now according to the time we get up in the morning half past ten instead of half past nine--it might be well to let the discussion remain general as long as you want it, although I believe by committees we would get along faster and more satisfactorily with constructive work. That is a suggestion. The floor is now open to anyone who wishes to speak but I think we ought to first fix an hour for adjournment. If there is no objection we will adjourn not later than 10 o'clock by the clock, which means 11 o'clock by the rising hour.

MR. TOTTY: You asked for suggestions with respect to rose stocks and Mr. Hill mentioned a matter, but I would like to have properly emphasized the difference between the rose stocks the florists use and require and the rose stocks the nurserymen use. We have found by considerable investigation, covering a period of ten years or more, that no rose stock is suitable but Manetti for our purpose. Some gentleman made the statement here today that it can be grown in America. I hope so, but at the present time it is not grown in such shape that we can use it. That is due to our climatic condition. In August and September we have a dry period which hardens up the Manetti stock too much. When you cut a rose to put the soft wood on it, if that scion is very hard the union is not nearly so good or so complete and the percentage of loss is quite large. That is the sole reason why we prefer to get the stock from abroad. If we can find a place in a few years where it can be grown and delivered to us in a soft, sappy condition, that is different. We don't want the Board to feel the nursery people are the entire thing. The florist industry is pretty important. It was stated before the Illinois Legislature that the florists of Illinois represented a larger capitalization than the steel business, including the Gary interests. They laughed but found it was so.

In regard to Manetti stock, I myself will use this year about 550,000. Mr.

Hill will use a little over 60,000, Mr. Pierson in the neighborhood of 1,000,000. It is really an important proposition, and I trust that you will bear that in mind before making any arbitrary rulings. I don't know that any are in prospect but if so I would like to have this considered.

MR. BURRAGE: If there is no question of tariff or protection, would you be good enough to say why there should be a limit to the number of hybrid, wholly greenhouse grown, orchids from Europe which I can import? Why there should be any limit of 10 or 100 or 1,000 hybrid orchids raised wholly in European greenhouses, unless they contain dangerous insects or plant diseases?

DR. MARLATT: These are new things brought in for introduction purposes?

MR. BURRAGE: Hybrids necessarily mean new things.

DR. MARLATT: But it does not mean they have not been imported by someone else.

MR. BURRAGE: My question is: Why should the Board put a limit on something which is not dangerous or injurious, where it has not come from a tropical country--wholly hybrid and wholly grown in greenhouses and wholly without soil and imported without soil?

DR. MARLATT: That is a very proper matter to bring before the Board for revision.

MR. BURRAGE: Are you willing to meet a committee of the American Orchid Society, of which I am at present President, to discuss this subject?

DR. MARLATT: We will be very glad to do so. The latch string is always hanging out.

Are there any other remarks?

DR. van SLOGTEREN: The eel worm which affects clover came from Dutch lily bulbs?

DR. MARLATT: So I am advised.

DR. van SLOGTEREN: Have you any scientific knowledge of the infection of clover from Dutch lily bulbs? We have no lily bulbs in Holland affected with eel worm.

DR. MARLATT: I doubt if there is a lily bulb in existence without some eel worms on it.

DR. van SLOGTEREN: We have none. I have never seen any infestation of lily bulbs. Before speaking of eel worms going over from one plant to another it is necessary from a scientific standpoint to know that the going from one plant to another is possible. I could not speak of my own experiments. I can tell you of other experiments. I have found thousands and thousands of infections of eel worms from narcissus and hyacinths and would be glad to give you a description of my experiments. I am quite sure I can convince you that in no case does an eel worm go from one bulb to another. I am a foreigner so it is difficult for me to speak so you can understand all that I say. I have shown you many photographs of our fields. I can personally guarantee you that the bulbs are free from disease and I should like so much to have you, Mr. Marlatt, or one of the members of the Board go to Holland and see our fields. It is my work and I have had Americans there and growers and phytopathologists. I have shown them all my fields there. They were astonished at the cleanliness of the bulbs. I understood you to say that you would consider cooperation between the phytopathologists of the different countries, to consider bulbs which can not be grown in America. I should like to say that the possibility of growing bulbs in America is not the basis of cooperation. It must be the freedom from disease and I have said I can appreciate the purpose of keeping your cultures free from disease, but I think it is not right to exclude a whole class of bulbs when it is possible that we can give you healthy bulbs. It is quite another thing when you say you will only let in bulbs which can not be grown in America, for then we do not quite agree. But don't you agree that a sound basis for cooperation must be freedom from disease of the bulbs or other kinds of plants? Thank you.

DR. MARLATT: I hope you will take occasion to discuss this matter with Dr. Cobb, who is recognized as perhaps the world's greatest authority on these pests. It would be a very good plan for you to get together and if I am in error you can

straighten it out between you. That is the impression I had from Dr. Cobb.

MR. BEATTIE: Experimental work has been done in this country by men in Dr. Orton's office on this subject and if the Holland gentlemen will come to my office I will see that they get in touch with Dr. Orton and Dr. Cobb.

MR. ATKINS: Mr. Chairman, in order to bring this meeting to a close I would like to propose a motion to have committees meet with the Federal Horticultural Board from time to time in order to adjust all these deductions or additions. Each group, as I understand it, has a legislative committee or a committee which has been appointed, and I would suggest, Sir, that a time be set aside for you or your Board to meet each of these committees from time to time as the occasion may come up and these various troubles can be adjusted in a way that will be satisfactory to you both.

DR. MARLATT: Gentlemen, we are getting near our adjournment hour. I am perfectly willing to continue the discussion tomorrow morning, as the Secretary said, as long as you want to discuss the matter. I don't know whether there is an opportunity tonight to arrange for any committee work and it would seem perhaps desirable to get together again tomorrow morning for that. That is for you to determine. Do you wish to continue this conference tomorrow morning--to try tomorrow to get right down to the constructive side of the matter and determine what you want us to consider, either through committees or as a whole? Those who would like to continue will please stand up.

(Quite a few men stood up)

Suppose we meet tomorrow morning gentlemen and finish up the discussion if there is any more. If not, we can get down to the business of forming committees and of considering details. Does that meet with your approval?

MR. HILL: A good many men present live a long distance away from Washington.

It is the desire of some men, especially those on legislative committees, to make an early appointment with the Board for the purpose of presenting their cases directly to the Board. Why would it not be a good plan to adjourn this evening and try to meet here with the Board tomorrow for committee work instead of meeting here for a continuation of the conference? Have authorized committees appointed to meet with the Board tomorrow, if possible, to check up.

MR. BRITTON: It seems to me to be a good idea to give everyone a chance to express their views in open meeting. However, you will get ahead much faster through committees than a large meeting like this.

MR. PIERSON: When you called for an expression from those who would like to continue the hearing, 90 per cent of those who stood up were bulb men. I would like to see you take the bulb men tomorrow morning as a committee. I am not interested in bulbs myself, however.

DR. MARLATT: We held a very important conference here in this room last spring which was called by the Secretary of Agriculture on the subject of the pink bollworm of cotton in the States of Texas, Louisiana and New Mexico. We had our open discussion for some time and then a committee was appointed to make its recommendations and the whole body came together again to hear the report of that committee and approve it. We can do it that way. Then nobody will be cut out of the final hearing and statement. The committees can make their definite recommendations after some discussion perhaps with the Board. The Department necessarily could not give a decision offhand. The decision would have to be taken up with the authorities and approved by the Secretary before it is issued. At least we could get down to some basis of recommendations. We have certain recommendations with regard to Manetti stocks. We have one in relation to Norway maples and a sort of hazy suggestion relative to bulbs, and a fairly definite suggestion relative to orchids but we have not got down to anything complete or

It is the duty of some one, especially those on legislative committees, to make a study comparable with my Board for the purpose of presenting some di-
gestible to the Board. Or would it not be a good plan to delegate this working out
why to that large city can such inquiries that members have leaders of society
have for a consideration of the questionnaire. Some educational questions
in most work are based innovations, it appears, to circle up.

Mr. Bailey: It seems to me it is a good idea to give everyone a copy of
matters that's going to come matters. However, you will not answer such factor
through questions that a large matters line this.

Mr. Lawson: Does you mean for an expression from them on each item in
matters the Bulletin, or you mean of those who have cy more well use. I would
like to see you make the bill was concerned matters to a committee. I do not be-
lieved in more speak, however.

Mr. Richard: My idea is very logical questions been in this room that
spring which was called by the Secretary of Bulletins on the Report of the
Public Relations of which is the Chairs of Boards. Questions had two Boards. It
had not been discussion for more than not also a committee not appointed to come
the questionnaires and the which help some judgment. Again it take the study of
the questions and matters it. We can do it that way. Some people will be not
and of the first matters and standard. The committees can make their matters
recommendations after some discussion matters with the Board. The Department
necessarily could not give a certain answer. The questions which must be
based the state the matters and approved by the Secretary which is the Board.
If there no work and then to come back to recommendations. In that matters
recommendations with regard to Board's minutes. We have one in relation to level
matter and a list of many organization matters in mind, and a table matters
regulation matters to stamps but on date but you does. Is matters employer or

comprahensive covering the subject at all. We ought to have that. We can only get it through small committees. If we come together tomorrow you can immediately break up in committees. The gentlemen interested in bulbs can meet together. It is perhaps not necessary for the orchid interests to meet. The gentlemen interested in any other subjects can get together, appoint committees, and perhaps have that committee instructed as to certain suggestions they want to make. I think it has been done more or less already. The nurserymen have done that and they can make reports and the reports will then be subjects for further conferences between these committees and the Board. In that way you will know what is done and what committees have been instructed to discuss various questions with the Board. The discussions with the Board will call for a considerable presentation of facts. That will probably take more or less the balance of the week. It will give the rest of you freedom to go about your ordinary affairs.

MR. VAUGHAN: The same question will come up in connection with bulbs that Mr. Burrage raised regarding orchids. Will this Board continue to determine whether one man can import 1,000 or another

DR. MARLATT (interposing) It never has begun. There has never been any discrimination at all. If you ask for 5,000 you get it. If another asks for 50,000 he can get it.

MR. VAUGHAN: Show me a merchant in another line of business who would allow the Department to tell him how much goods he can import. Show me an industry that would put up with that kind of red tape for a minute.

DR. MARLATT: Are there any other discussions? If not suppose we meet tomorrow morning to form committees and get down to details. There may be a chance for such discussion as you may want. Without objection, then, we will declare the meeting adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

DR. MARLATT called the meeting to order at 9:15 a. M., May 16.

DR. MARLATT: The last thing last night was the suggestion of committee arrangement, but the Secretary is very anxious--he is going to come in himself a little later, he is at a Cabinet meeting now--to give you a final word; at least he is very anxious to be assured that everybody had had a chance to say what he has intended to say and that the meeting has been fully open and fair and free in the matter of discussion.

Before we take up the matter of committees and put that before you we will give a last chance to anybody who has not spoken. I believe one man agreed to wait until this morning. If anybody wants to submit any thought or any matter for discussion prior to the committee work, now is the time.

MR. W. J. JONES: Appertaining to orchids, there really has not been much brought up touching on orchids so I have not thought it necessary to say anything so far. As I am here representing Thomas Young who, I believe I can say without contradiction, has the largest collection of orchids in the world--we have in stock at the present time 150,000 and 50,000 seedlings. There has been a lot of controversy to the effect that orchids can not be raised from seed. Several matters have been brought up appertaining to a few varieties not grown from seed. The reason they were not taken up is that in England and Belgium they have no commercial value. During the last 40 years only a few new orchids have been grown. When Cattleyas became favorites they were raised from seed and proved satisfactory. Odontoglossums were also raised from seed but they are not satisfactory in this country. On the commercial side we have not the demand for sprays which they have in the other countries.

Q. Actually during the meeting in order at that is the, May 2d.

Mr. Kennedy. The Lord Mayor's office was the consumption of munitions manufacture, but the industry is very primitive--he is going to come in himself a little later, so he is an honest munitions man--we give you a first which is very welcome to the average Irish everybody but not a person in Ireland to say and that the meeting has been fully open and fair and in the order of discussion.

Before we take up the matter of munitions and you must inform and be with give a less chance in supply who has our problem. I believe one man against it will still this remains. If anybody wants to submit any thoughts or any matter for consideration prior to the committee work, now is the time.

Mr. V. J. Hodge. Appreciating is readily, the-r really has not been made aware of working in unless we I hope but thought is necessary to say something in that. As I am Assistant Director Trade Union, I believe I not only represent conservatives, but the Labour Politicians of America in the world--we are as sure as the greatest line 10,000,000 workmen. There has been a lot of misunderstanding in the effort that concerns our war be raised from some Trade Union leaders that brought up discussions in a few weeks ago. The reason they were not taken up is that in organized and helping the commercial wing. Having our last do place was a [illegible] made gains. Then difficulties become serious they may raise from local and place unanimously. Representatives are also called upon but they are not responsible in this meeting. In the commercial side we have had the chance to make that long away in the-right conditions.

The demand for Phalaenopsis, Odontioda, Angraecum and Aerides does not justify their being produced in large quantities. We have the Phalaenopsis. In England they have a bigger demand and the climatic conditions permit them to be grown more satisfactorily than here. I have grown them very satisfactorily in Canada, which I might state sometimes has hotter summers than here and vastly colder winters, and they have not the same difficulty in the demand for sprays. Phalaenopsis could always demand a fair commercial price. If the amateurs want those varieties I think that under the quarantine regulations they always can get them as they are always to be bought in this country and England.

With respect to Vandas I had an opportunity to buy 500 to 1,000 in this country since the quarantine but we were not justified in buying them. We go in largely for the best commercial varieties and now at the present time we are crossing and hybridizing the very finest and lightest of the products which Europe has produced. We pay very high figures, which the Federal Board knows from the permits we have asked for, to get those plants over for that one purpose. Only last week I had a latter from a friend of mine from England which said this country is far behind in up-to-date hybrids, but I think very shortly we shall be ahead of those men of Europe, England in particular, as we are sparing no expense to get all the up-to-date varieties it is possible to get for that one purpose and it is our idea, when we can, to distribute all these varieties in this country and, while in a sense we favor the quarantine, there is one particular subject and that is the wild species. I do not know who or how at the present time--but here I have a letter we received this week from a large grower in Belgium in which he states "We have heard that the quarantine of your country is to be lifted. Therefore we with pleasure quote our price, which is 15 lbs. per hundred for Cattleyas," about 75 cents each. If that embargo is lifted to allow those wild species to come in what is the use of trying our best to distribute

finer varieties through the country, going to the expense we are? The hybrids which are being raised at the present time are far superior to any species. True, we can not do without species because we have found and still find that by growing up-to-date hybrids on the finer species you get a better product. You get a finer product and that is the reason, in a way, that we uphold the quarantine on the wild species.

It has been said by a good many people that orchids do not introduce insects. Before coming to this country I was the largest importer in England. I supplied such firms as Sander, Low, and several Belgian firms with imported stock. In unpacking those orchids I have found all kinds of insects. Even in Canada I have now preserved in the high school of the town where I lived a scorpion found among the orchids, and it is one of the most deadly insects to plants and human beings. If they can be introduced by orchids, why not by other plants. Those Belgian thrips would live in the outdoor climates of the warmer parts of this country almost as readily as the common lady bird. These are only two of the subjects I have found, and independent of other things much larger, as different kinds of snakes and rats. They not only introduce insects, but animals as well.

While I am on the subject of seedlings, I have here with me a seedling I could show you which has been produced and flowered inside of 3½ years. It has been said the orchid takes too long to produce before it flowers. That is just a sample to show it can be done. This is only one of thousands we have now to show at our stations.

Many writing through the country, useful to its members as well. Co-operation which are being defined as the present time are for members in any capacity, as you are or whatever service happens to have found and will also from by getting up-to-date figures on the fiber systems and get a better article. You are a fiber product and that is the reason, in a way, that we should the connection on the air queries.

It has been said by a good many people that cyprian do not increase because dairy farming in this country I see the larger in-order is designed. I practice some time on country, low, and several Dairies fiber with improved stock. In marketing these products I have found all kinds of losses. Even in Canada I have some problems in the high amount of the time when I live a surplus food supply the condition, and it is one of the most deadly losses to plants and farms. It may can be increased by canals, any not up other plants. Some methods which lies in the outdoor climates of the summer months of this country also results in the amount lost stock. There are only two of the products I say items, and improvement of other things much large, as SUPPLIES kinds of machinery and pots. They are only necessary harvest, and animals as well.

While I am on the subject of machinery, I have hard this as a meeting I would show you which has been produced and financial losses of my place. It has been said the events cause the land to produce better is fiberts. That is just a method to make it use to grow. This is only one of thousands we have met to show it was existence.

MR. BURDETT (Vaughan's Seed Store): The discussion here yesterday by some of the gentlemen from abroad has raised the question of whether the insects which have been discovered in certain importations are as dangerous to horticulture as people who lack scientific information might believe. That is a subject that is very difficult for a layman to understand. The insects are usually referred to by Latin names, and these names are so imposing that it would seem to one who is unfamiliar with the insects themselves that the name alone would be sufficient to destroy the wheat crop or the corn crop of this country. And some of the gentlemen said that to a scientist these names do not have that menace. I have two letters here which I would like to place in the record in order to support by American testimony something of the points that were made by these gentlemen from England and Holland. The first is dated December 14, 1921, signed by the Chairman of the Board, to the Vaughan Seed Store of New York, and gives certain reasons why these plants were permitted to enter, those reasons being chiefly that the plants were new.

DR. MARLATT: Will you read the reasons?

MR. BURDETT: Certainly, I will read the letter:

"Referring to Mr. Owrey's letter of December 10, with reference to the Astilbe clumps which were forwarded to you after they had been cut up and washed free from earth, it should be understood that this was not a mere waiving of the requirements that plants imported must be free from sand, soil or earth, but that the Board made this exception for the following reasons:

The Board understood that the plants had been thoroughly washed, in compliance with the Board's order, but that in cutting the roots open recesses and cavities in the interior roots were found filled with earth. In view of this effort at compliance, and the further statement that these plants were rarities and that it would not be easy or possible to replace them, the Board authorized you to cut

Mr. [illegible] (Congressman-Good Govern). Mr. Chairman, will you yield?

Mr. [illegible]. Yes.

Mr. [illegible] (Congressman-Good Govern). Do you think that the Government should have the power to take over the property of an individual without compensation?

Mr. [illegible]. Well, I think that depends upon the circumstances. In the case of the Alien Property Custodian, I think it was a wartime measure, and I think it was a proper measure. I have not been in favor of the confiscation of property by the Government without compensation, but I would like to know what you have in mind.

Mr. [illegible] (Congressman-Good Govern). I have been informed that the Alien Property Custodian taken over the property of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, and I would like to know if you think that was necessary.

Mr. [illegible]. Will you move that measure?

Mr. [illegible]. Certainly, I will read the letter.

(Following is Mr. [illegible]'s letter of December 22, with reference to the Alien Property Custodian taken over Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey [illegible] to the Alien Property Custodian.)

Mr. [illegible]. Do you think that the Government should, in peacetime, take over the property of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey [illegible] to the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. [illegible]. Well, I think that depends upon the circumstances. In the case of the Alien Property Custodian, I think it was a wartime measure, and I think it was a proper measure. I have not been in favor of the confiscation of property by the Government without compensation, but I would like to know what you have in mind.

up or divide the roots in such manner that all earth could be washed out, after which proceeding the plants could be entered. It has been further specifically ordered, that in future importers of such roots should be instructed to have them divided or cut in portions not to exceed two or three crowns each by the foreign shipper so that there can be assurance of the elimination of all interior cavities containing soil. The Board was further advised that such division of roots was the common method of planting them for reproduction purposes and could be made in the country of export without material injury. The necessity for this action is further emphatically shown by two or three recent shipments of Astilbe clumps which contained in these cavities or within the clumps grubs and beetles of a very destructive European curculionid (Otiorhynchus sulcatus)."

Now, Mr. J. C. Vaughan sent this letter to the Secretary of the Society of American Florists, Mr. John Young, with a request that Mr. Young ask Prof. H. C. Irish of St. Louis, formerly connected with Shaw's Garden, who is an entomologist of standing, about the beetle which was referred to as being a destructive European beetle, and a copy of Prof. Irish's reply to Mr. Vaughan's letter I will read, dated December 31, 1921:

"I received your request for information concerning a beetle through Mr. John Young, Secretary S.A.F. The insect to which you refer is known sometimes as grape vine beetle and also as the scarred snout beetle (Otiorhynchus sulcatus).

This species is supposed to be a native of Europe. So far as I have been able to learn it was first found in this country in 1831 and for a good many years was only known in New England, Quebec and Nova Scotia, and then only rarely seen.

For some 20 years it has been observed more commonly and has been reported as quite injurious to some greenhouse plants in Massachusetts, Connecticut and

New Jersey. The latest report that I have seen records its occurrence in Vancouver, B.C.

It appears, therefore, to extend across the continent in southern British America and northern United States. I, myself, question whether the species is not native of this continent as well as Europe. I find no record of its having been introduced, although it may have been brought here and the fact not known. A late report mentions specimens as having been found on the roots of the lily of the valley and other ornamental herbacious plants imported from Holland. It is probable, therefore, that specimens may be introduced from Europe, although the insect is already established here.

If there are any other matters pertaining to it that you wish me to investigate, I shall be glad to do so."

DR. MARLATT: I am very much interested in the report of Mr. Irish of the Shaw Botanic Garden.

MR. BURDETT: He is now with the school system of St. Louis and is the entomologist of the Society of American Florists.

DR. MARLATT: Well, I advise them to get a new man. I believe he is the same man who was reported yesterday to have made an examination of the Shaw Botanic garden and certified that there were no injurious insects in the gardens - the same man.

MR. BURDETT: I do not think so. I do not believe that he had anything to do with that. I believe it was understood that a representative of the Department of Agriculture made that report.

DR. MARLATT: I believe he did but it was stated yesterday that Prof. Irish made an examination of the garden.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

MR. BECKETT: I did not hear that report.

DR. MARLATT: Mr. Sasser is here and he can make the report, I believe. The fact is that there was a grub in the roots; it happened to be that in this particular case this man was given the scientific name and hence he was clever enough to use it again. The significant thing is that the grub and bettle were found in those roots. It might be any grub or any bettle hibernating in the soil; it happened to be this one; next time it would be something else. The significance is indicated in the fact that a Japanese bettle came in in just such earth. I do not know what the Japanese bettle will do. The alfalfa weevil came in in just such earth in roots and now has invaded half a dozen states, and is going to be one of the greatest pests in this country. The clover beetles came in in just such earth in roots, and a dozen others. It is an accident, but any bettle may come in, and hence the desi ability of getting the earth out. It was not this insect; it was the possibility of any insect coming in that made it necessary to cut out these_____ _____.

MR. BURNETT: The letter I believe stated that the fact that this particular insect was found on the _____ _____was proof of the necessity of the law.

DR. BILL: That is quite likely the fact.

MR. BURNETT: And is it not true that the law is designed to include new insects rather than those that are already in this country.

DR. BILL: The law is designed to include insects, and the package that shows by the very fact that it did carry insects could carry insects would come under the law, would it not. If you would allow these roots to come in without washing how would you know what insect was in them.

MR. BURDETT: Perhaps it would be possible to ascertain in a certain country from which these roots were a ported

DR. BALL: That fact has already been ascertain and published by the Department giving injurious insects of the European countries and the other countries from which we are importing.

MR. Burdett Isn't it true that certain insects that do no harm in their native countries when they are exported to another country do.

DR. BALL: The alfalfa weevil is hardly known as an injurious insect in the region of Europe from which it was exported to this country and yet it is one of the most serious insect pests. I worked in Utah with it for many years and it is a very serious pest. If it is anywhere near as serious in the eastern States as it is in Utah with the trouble they have to raise alfalfa they would have to give it up. It is a menace with us out there where alfalfa is an industry. The whole question is not a question of any individual insects that come in, but the question of a vehicle that is capable of carrying an insect.

MR. BURDETT: That is very interesting, thisexplanation is very interesting. Might I make this suggestion that there are a great many people in the United States who are not familiar with the latin names of insects and that much of the feeling that exists against quarantine 37 is due to inability of an ordinary man to understand the reasoning behind it.

The lady who appeared here for the Garden Club of America suggested that it was difficult for the ladies to understand why scillas were a menace to the wheat crop of the United States, whereas other bulbs precisely similar were not a menace and were admitted. The gentleman who represents Great Britain stated yesterday that among the insects which were listed in a bulletin of the Department has having been detected on imports was a beneficent insect. The gentleman from Holland stated that a beetle was specified which lives only in Manna. Now, the explanation concerning these insects comes not from the Department, but from outsiders. It seems to a layman as though the Department were not entirely frank. You cannot escape from the belief that in its definition of this quarantine the Department is attempting to over-state its case because it has applied things as being dangerous which scientists say are not dangerous.

DR. BALL: Did they state that these were dangerous, or simply state that these were insects they found.

MR. BECKETT: True, but there is no occasion to state that unless it was a merit to have found them, and unless the discovery of them was a protection for American horticulture.

DR. BALL: You seem to entirely get away from the idea that anything that may carry one insect may carry another insect. The Japanese beetle was not known to be an injurious insect at all anywhere in the world, and if you are interested a little trip to N.J. or N.Y. will show you what an insect that was not listed as an injurious insect, will do when imported into a new community. The citrus canker was not even listed as an injurious disease on citrus stock anywhere in the world until it was brought into

America. The problem is a great deal bigger than the scientific name of the insect.

DR. MARLATT: There has been a good deal of discussion of this list and I simply want to give a word of explanation about that. The plant material that comes to this country from abroad is inspected now by our own people very largely. In the old days all the material came in, most of it was inspected at destination by State inspectors. They submitted lists to us of everything for identification and for record. These lists covered everything they found, insects thoroughly well established in this country, insects that were new to the country and the lists were very long. For the encouragement of the inspectors these lists were printed once a month or once a year or once in three or four months, giving the entire lists so we would know just the flow of life with plants in this country. In each of these lists the important subjects were listed in the beginning in the introductory paragraph, but it was clearly indicated that this was a complete list. In the earlier lists they included everything. In the later lists they included only the injurious species. It was simply to show the flow of life coming with that material. The list got so large that these were eliminated. These lists were never published in the sense that they were given to the public to alarm the public or overstate the case. They were published in a small edition usually on a typewriter or manifold sheets or printed in some cases and sent to all the inspectors and the people in interest, but they were never given to various journals or published in various journals or published and given wide circulation. They were for the information of the technical men who were doing the work. These lists included the

dangerous things and they included everything else. It was a record of the flow of life into this country. The point has been made of the fact that they included insects that ~~came into~~ reached this country. They may have included insects that were beneficial even, or at least not injurious, but it was simply a matter of record and it has no significance at all. The significant facts of information which were published and made public to the world were only the dangerous and important ones. They were listed briefly, as I stated at the beginning of these reports and they we e published finally to the world once a year or thereabouts in documents whic dealt only with a small number of important inju ious pests. It seems to me a great deal has been made out of a very small matter and out of a perfectly proper record of findings.

MR. SASSCER: In regard to this insect, it has a scientific name but is commonly known as one of the grape root weevils. It not only infests nursery stock but is listed as a pest of strawberry and grape and evergreen, and to further exemplify matters, here is a photograph of an individual. Here is a very good picture (indicating). There it is (indicating) in its natural size and probably in some of the material we talked about today.

MR. EDDY: I felt like saying before the meeting closed, Mr. Secretary,--I am speaking as a representative of those who are starting new and making contact with the people interested in gardens--that a splendid sentiment was expressed yesterday by Mr. McFarland when he spoke of the fact that more gardens meant less police. Flowers are the Esperanto of the world. They speak a language that all understand. We have come to a time when we are finding the conference is getting us somewhere. I am conscious that our Government here is doing the best it can. I am conscious its representatives have called us in a spirit of accommodation. I believe the interests here that financially have been somewhat trespassed on are really being helped forward by the attitude of the Government. I am delighted to think of the suggestion here of the Holland gentleman who says there isn't a science for America and a science for Holland--there is a science for us all. I am delighted that he said "Dr. Marlatt, I wish you might come to Holland and see what we are doing." Isn't that the idea. Don't we really want our scientists to go abroad and see what they are doing? We have insufficient knowledge. That is the idea I want to leave here. We are getting the idea that the Government is helping us forward.

MR. ELLIOTT: Yesterday there was some discussion by representatives of various Plant Boards--of Louisiana, Florida, Mississippi, Texas, and possibly others--concerning citrus fruit and the recent menace to the citrus fruit industry. At the time it seemed to me that the entire story had not been told, but with the

example of the gentleman before me who talked of barberry candles, I would not care to add to the amusement of this gathering. I spent an hour or so in the Congressional Library yesterday. The citrus industry in the South and California is tremendous. The citrus industry in Florida is equal to all other industries combined. Probably it is the most important in California. From my own surveys I have seen its importance in Mississippi and Louisiana. The value of the crops runs into millions, possibly tens of millions or hundreds of millions. Such an industry will be protected to the limit. In examining the records yesterday, however, I find there is not a single native citrus. Certainly not a single native commercial citrus. They are all foreign plants, and I submit, gentlemen, that if the Federal Horticultural Board had been in existence at the beginning of the citrus industry in the United States they would have discovered the existence of possible citrus blight and we would now have no citrus industry to protect.

DR. BALL: I presume that if the gentleman looked up in the Encyclopedia very carefully he would find that the entire citrus industry is based on an importation by the United States Government. The Navel orange was introduced and is a species which was distributed entirely by this Government.

MR. BEATTIE: The old tree is growing in the greenhouse today.

MR. EDDY: Our citrus industry is purely an academic question. It is not a native plant.

DR. BALL: I think we are ready for the recommendations of the committees.

MR. SUDWORTH: There was a gentleman last night who desired to speak and was prevented because of our adjournment.

MR. CARRILLO: There are only a few words I want to say because I have seen there is not a ghost of a chance of having this Quarantine 37 repealed. I was the biggest enemey of that quarantine as far as orchids are concerned when it was

established. I am its greatest friend now. I must be absolutely frank, brutally frank. It has not done me good in my pocket. When the quarantine was established my idea was that we were going to be put out of business by the man who had accumulated the largest stocks of orchids in the world,--he had enticed there by some means the gentlemen from the Board and convinced them that he could produce orchids in tremendous quantities to ~~fit~~ meet the needs of the United States. That is an absolutely false statement. Time has passed and time has proved that that was not true. But, by hard work and conscientious patience we have accomplished something we thought we could not accomplish; that is to keep our plants and keep them forever. For that reason I am for the quarantine absolutely now. Not that I ever thought that the Board had a leg to stand on when they put the quarantine into effect, because I think it is absolutely illegal. I think that the Board does not have a right and never had a right to attribute to itself all the privileges of Congress. I eliminated the bulk of the affair from the quarantine. I considered that the Board put it on only because the Board thinks that we can produce orchids in this country and we must do it. Now I agree with the Board, although I don't think they have a leg to stand on. I lost my patience when I heard talk about this legal affair. I don't think the Board would be a judge in the matter--not either the Secretary of Agriculture. He has backed the Board and I want to know if there is anybody who would ever say that human nature has changed so that the man who has transgressed and violated the law is going to be his own judge. My idea was in the beginning to go to court with this affair and I am astounded that a big interest like that florist association never undertook any steps to find a judge. Now I don't want them to find a judge. It has done me good in my pocket. We had a lot of fibs when we had the hearing that really was a joke. It was when all the orchid growers and dealers convened in Washington to present their case before Dr. Marlatt. At that time there were two gentlemen,

one of whom is absent today. The other has come with his same old stories. Now they do me good as I tell you with brutal frankness again but these are stories. The gentleman who thought he was going to put us out of business because he had accumulated a tremendous lot of plants and caught us unaware is not going to accomplish his object. I think we will all live notwithstanding that he had a tremendous and great advantage.

Now all I ask of the Board is to be absolutely fair and square with everybody. I don't want to know what this or the other man is importing, but I want to know if this or the other plant is imported into the country. Is that too much to ask Dr. Marlatt?

DR. MARLATT: What was that second part of your query?

MR. CARRILLO: I don't care who imports plants or for what purpose. I will give you a special instance so you will understand absolutely my intention. I have been told the Board has granted a permit to import 2,000 Cattleya fabia and 1,000 Cymbidiums of some kinds I don't know. If that is true, I don't care to know who is importing them but I would like to know that those plants have come into the country so as to accommodate my business to the importation of other kinds. That is, I don't want to butt into the movements of my neighbors. I don't care to. But I want to find out what plants have been imported in the country so I can accommodate my business to that.

DR. MARLATT: I see no reason why that should not be given. It is all available and we publish year after year, time after time, the total importations of orchids. We never got down to the details of species but that can be given also. I think it is a very desirable thing to do. There is no objection at all that I can see.

MR. CARILLO: Then I want equal treatment for all of us, so this man might not think that the other man is importing because he has a pull in Washington.

DR. MARLATT: Nobody has a pull in Washington--in this Board at least.

MR. CARRILLO: I am very glad to hear it.

DR. MARLATT: The man who received the most permits from the Board is a man who fought the Board the most, and not one passed under my eyes.

MR. CARRILLO: As to that I must say I admire the man. Our interests are in a different sphere today.

DR. MARLATT: I was not speaking of the orchid man. He has been a good friend of the Board just as you will be from now on.

MR. CARRILLO: Thank you. In order to end this talk I would like to know several things that I asked the Board the other time when I was fighting this Quarantine 37 and which always went unanswered.

Now I put the case to the Board that the Canadian people could import, and in fact did import, a large quantity of wild orchids which they could buy for a song or for very little money, grow the plants in Canada on the other side of the United States, and then flood our markets with the flowers they could produce greatly cheaper than we can, because they have cheaper ~~rents~~ and the plants they can import flower and they throw them away and replace them to great advantage. At the time I told the Board and I wrote the Board--and I have their answer in my pocket--and I said "If you intend to kill our business wouldn't it be proper to stop importations of flowers from Canada so we can last longer?" That question always went unanswered.

DR. MARLATT: I can give you the answer now. I urge you to take that up with Congress. Congress is now considering the tariff question. That is really a tariff matter. It ~~is~~ are plainly indicated that this conference has nothing to do with the tariff.

MR. CARRILLO: That is where we differ. It is not a question of tariff but of insects. If injurious insects may come on the orchids and go to Canada and be

developed and grown there and shipped back in the flowers to the United States how can you get out of the question that you have kept the plants out and don't keep the flowers out which may bring the very same insect although the insects are a small thing as I have been told and may come in flowers as well as plants?

DR. MARLATT: If it is shown that the insects or pests come with cut flowers of orchids that brings it under our control. If it is only a matter of tariff control it is outside of our field. We have looked into that matter, not as a matter of control but as a matter of interest, and there is nothing in the information which shows that there is very serious competition from Canada except in the border cities like Detroit.

MR. CARRILLO: That is bad enough. To take all those markets away is bad enough. I am willing to meet anybody else on the same terms. If they are given a great advantage over us then some remedy must be found for it.

Now the second question is that I would like to have the red tape removed. I never imported any plants after the quarantine because I always feared the red tape connected with it.

DR. MARLATT: We don't charge anything for the tape.

MR. CARRILLO: I know that but it is a little too long. If we could import, see, and work some plans by which our plants could come here quickly, and go back if absolutely necessary, It is a new thing to us, the matter of this quarantine and putting that new red tape on it. Before, we got our plants, had them examined and shipped, and if we were on the spot we got them very quickly and never lost them. Perhaps I should prefer the Washington red tape to the New York killing because I had thousands of plants killed in New York through that blessed gas although the Department never found that gas did any damage to our plants.

DR. MARLATT: You sent some of those same plants to us and we planted them in the greenhouse and they turned out to be healthy plants. How do you explain that?

MR. CARRILLO: That is a miracle that I can not understand.

DR. MARLATT: I don't think we lost any.

MR. CARRILLO: I am very glad to hear it but I lost thousands and it hurt me. The plant may stand more gas than the human being.

DR. MARLATT: A great deal more.

MR. CARRILLO: And come out in much better condition but my plants dies by the thousands through that gas. I was very sorry that it happened because it hurt me.

DR. MARLATT: Our people are not expert in taking care of orchids and that may have been the reason why they lived.

MR. CARRILLO: That may have been the case.

I hope this quarantine will stay on forever and I would like it very much to have it so tight that no plants, no orchids, at all will ever be imported into the United States. (Applause).

BARON DE ~~VOS VAN STEENWIJK~~ Gow Schoutenden: I would be very glad to receive information, namely what will be the basis on which these committees are going to work. What interest are going to be represented among these committees, and how will the committees be selected, and how many committees will there be.

DR. MARLATT: We still want to make a last appeal. The Orchid conference to which the last speaker referred was held in Washington perhaps a year ago and fifty or more people present. A stenographic record was kept of everything that was said, and if anyone is interested in that conference we will be very glad to ~~have~~ get that record and let them look it over; it is available.

I am going to take up the subject of these committees. I want to mention one thing, however, first. I am one of those depised entomologists, and there was something said about the entomologists. I think I ~~know how~~ should like to answer that. It was represented that an entomologist introduced the gypsy moth into New England. The man who introduced the gypsy moth happened to be a French Professor who taught French at Harvard University who was so little of an entomologist that he had an idea that the gypsy moth with which he was familiar in Europe could be crossed with the silk worm and then liberate it and then he could go out into the forest and pick silk shirts off of the trees. He was an amateur! Now, I could mention a number of other things, but I won't take your time. The suggestion was made that we get down to constructive work through committees, and a general understanding that that would be done was reached last evening. The subjects that I have in mind for such committee work, and

it is subject to revision, are first a committee of florists to consider the bulb subject, or any other subject that they may wish to have the Department consider in connection with regulation three, that is the changes in regulation 3, that would cover bulbs and any other subject of interest to florists. The nurserymen have already presented their report in which they have asked for the consideration of _____. They have asked for the consideration of planting out stock for a period of three years. The orchid interest here was represented by Mr. Burrows, I think who stated that he wanted to have a conference with the Department and Board on the subject of Hybrid orchids, not the forest or wild orchids, but the hybrid orchids from Europe or other countries. He said he was not in a hurry for the conference; some time next fall when we were all together and can get together to consider it. Then we have the public or the amateurs which was represented here in the discussion by Mr. McFarland, and their interest, of course, is a peculiar one and relates to the persons throughout the country who would like to import plants for their own use. This would cover public institutions and experiment stations and botanical gardens. Now, if there is anything that could be done in that line we would be very glad to listen to recommendations, and the field is open to Mr. McFarland and the committee to come forward with these recommendations at any time. The Department's point of view in respect to these committees is that we want constructive suggestions. We have asked for them for two or three years which indicates our purpose to deal fairly with any constructive suggestions that you have. It will be of interest not only to our own people, but also to the foreign delegates who are here. Now, it seems

to me proper for the chairman to call for these committees if there are such, or at least to give public announcement that at any time such committees can come forward and present t eir points of view. I think it is only fair to say for the information of the conference that the Board promised to go to California now in a few days to attend a big conference that has been arranged there on matters of particular interest to the Pacific Coast, and that we will have very little time therefore in the few days remaining to take up such matte s in detail, but the machinery can be gotten together and perhaps some work can be done.

MR. HARRISON: The Committee of the American Association of Nurserymen are ready to report as follows:

We are not only nurserymen but fruit growers and need the best hardy fruit tree stocks that can be produced and many of our nurserymen are growing general farm crops. We are anxious to protect American horticulture from introducing further injurious insect pests, and submit the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Executive Committee and Legislative Committee and other attending nurserymen go on record as approving Sections 2, 3, 4, 5 of Regulation No. 5 as now in force except that Norway and Schmedlori maples in 4 ft. to 8 ft. whips for trans-planting and not finished stocks for resale be admitted under regulation for a period of 3 years from June 1st, 1922; and furthermore we approve the action of the Federal Horticultural Board in fully investigating the production and quality of mmmetti and other rose stocks in the U. S. A."

DR. MARLATT: These are pretty large trees, arn't they.

MR. HARRISON: The idea seemed to prevail. That is only our recommendation in order to get good straight seedlings.

DR. Von [illegible]: (Holland) My I ask a question of the duty of the committees. If the Conference had asked us to pass on the basis of interchange of plants, reasonable freedom of disease, and will they consider that question. If the basis of the work of the committees is only the possibility to grow stocks in America it is quite another question, and we must look from another side, and so the only basis on a scientific matter can be for reasonable freedom from disease, and I should like to have answered that question by the Board.

DR. BALL: You want the Committee to consider the question of the International agreement for admission of plants to all countries on a reasonable certificate of freedom from disease and plant pests. Is that the statement?

DR. Von [illegible]: Yes.

DR. MARLATT: This is primarily, I think you will realize, a conference of American growers of plants and of Americans interested in plants. It is not an International conference. Nevertheless you are here by invitation, or at least by hearty welcome, and since you are here we will be very glad to give you an opportunity, if possible, this week,— because we will be leaving and be gone a month or more-for a conference from your standpoint of the whole subject. We shall be very glad to give you that opportunity, and probably tomorrow morning if you want, as far as I know that would be convenient.

MR. BALL: It might be well to make that conference a little larger and at the suggestion of the other delegates, if any one wishes to suggest a delegate from this country to sit in that conference with delegates from foreign countries and make it a truly international conference. The suggestion is that this country be represented by others than the Board.

MR. VAUGHN: I would suggest that Mr. Eissle represent the florists.

MR. EISSLE: I would rather be excused but I would suggest that the Chairman of the florists, and the Legislative Committee be substituted, Mr. McHutchinson.

MR. McHUTCHINSON: I want to be excused from that. I think I have done all I feel I am physically able to do. Just while I am on my feet I want to say a word. This conference, I understood was to get the ideas of the different organizations. We have expressed our views. We want florists stock to be considered separately from nursery stock. We think the blanket matter with regard to permits should be in favor of those that wanted the stocks. In other words, not exclude, but include it and shut it out if there was any fear of it bringing in insect pests and plant diseases. I will just put in a few words on that point. The written recommendations submitted by the Tariff and Legislative Committee were based on the action of the Society of American Florists at the Detroit Convention, confirmed by the Executive Committee at its last session. We confirmed these recommendations, which we ask the Board to consider. We have no others to make except that the blanket feature apply on stock allowed entry instead of stock excluded. We ask that all florist stock that is now excluded by 37 be allowed entry unless it is necessary to exclude

specific items from specific localities in accordance with the plant quarantine Act. The Society of American Florists is a large organization; it contains many men that grow nothing but carnations; others that grow nothing but orchids; others nothing but roses. Many of them are in favor of excluding everything else, and it is a very difficult to agree to a plan when you go into details in this matter. I have not thought one word about my own business. I have not mentioned by own business. I am subordinating that entirely to what I consider my duty as handling this matter for the florists. Irrealize I am not qualified to handle such a big matter. You asked us for our recommendations; we have given them; we know the final decision is with you and we leave it in your hands.

DR. MARLATT: This is intended for the report on the florists.

MR. McHUTCHINSON. Yes Sir.

DR. MARLATT: The florists were supposed to include the bulb people. Apparently the bulb people want to be considered on a different program, on a program of the revision of Regulation 3, so that if the bulb interest as a particular unit of the florists want to come to the Board on that subject we would be glad to have them do so, both the importers and the growers of bulbs.

MR. ELLIOT: Supplementing the report of the Nursery Committee, as representing a nursery and operating outside of that organization, I would recommend that the Board consider the advisability of admitting a plant request in good faith for strictly propagating purposes, and which it is promised in good faith will not be and is not intended for resale, that such plants be admitted.

MR. HENRY: As an importer representing dealers, importers and distributors may I suggest that we have a committee to hear our case, as differentiated from the use of the bulbs by the florists and as differentiated by the other people who import bulbs to this country. As resident American interest engaged in the business of importing, jobbing and distributing bulbs we would like to have a committee appointed to represent our case as an elaboration on the items that may be important.

DR. MARLATT: Will you appoint that committee.

MR. HENRY: Yes sir, for such later date as may be the Board's convenience here, Is that agreeable?

DR. BALL: Yes, you would have to meet the Board on the question of bulbs as represented by the Committee.

MR. HENRY: Therefore I would hold myself as representing that board or such committee still to be appointed.

MR. VAUGHN: I am wondering if the chairman made it perfectly plain that this item that he read is merely a postscript to the general brief that he filed on behalf of the Society of American Florists.

MR. McHUTCHINSON: Yes sir.

DR. MARLATT: We have heard from every group in a general way excepting the amateur group, and ~~of course~~, the spokesman for that group (Mr. McFarland) is not here, but the Secretary of Agriculture advised Mr. McFarland that he would be very glad to meet with ~~any of them~~ him at some later time for the discussion of the particular subject that he presented, that is in relation to the legal aspects which he objected to as interfering with the securing of plants by any amateur at will, ~~and~~ with respect to the principal recommendations ~~of the group as to~~ additional ports of entry. There is no disagreement on ~~that point~~; it is

simply a question of funds.

DR. BALL: On that particular recommendation your actions speak a great deal louder than your words. The Federal Horticultural Board is a Board created by law to serve the horticultural and other interests of the United States and it is your representation to your representatives in Congress that will determine very largely the support that that Board gets. If you want additional ports of entry your appeal, should be to your congressional representatives and the committees that have charge of that in congress, and the Bureau of the Budget, to first determine what the expenses of the Department of Agriculture shall be and only secondary to the Board. It will be much more effective if you make your appeal there than it will if we make the appeal there and say that you asked for it.

DR. MARLATT: The second point was bulbs. That has already been settled; we have announced from the beginning that we are ready to reconsider the bulb matter and make any changes that may be made in safety, and that will be something that we hope to take up with all interests. The third

Note.--This involved several items, namely; (1) seeds of hardy ornamentals to be put in the same class as flower seeds, (2) any importation to be admitted, i.e., no restriction on the ground of availability, (3) modify soil exclusion, (4) modify or abandon bond. The enumeration given by the Chairman was merely from memory.

without much basis, and that is that the public gardens and public institutions should be allowed to import at will or as they see fit without any restrictions whatsoever on the theory as he put forth that no such gardens ~~of such importations~~ had ever brought in any pests and therefore would not bring in any pests. That is a line of reasoning which I confress I am not able to follow. I do not want to discuss it at any length, but there is

no providence that looks particularly after botanic gardens, and in as much as they get most of their stuff from ~~import~~ there is much more chance. That has been illustrated a thousand times by the Department of Agriculture importations that ~~are~~ vastly outnumber~~ed by~~ all the botanic gardens put together. I forget how many, I think it is over 40,000 importations, but they represent more than 10,000 as I recall it. In the main we will be in a point of adjustment in all of these recommendations. We are giving the botanic gardens and similar institutions a good deal of liberty. We do not require the bond; we do not limit them to new plants; if they think they need a plant of any kind now that is available in this country or not, they are allowed to get it. In other words, botanic gardens are recognized as big public institutions and are given special privileges under the Act. The other matters, I think, have all been covered.

MR. BURNETT: The discussion of amateurs interests here has apparently been limited to those amateurs who desire to import direct. Now, out of the perhaps ten million people in the United States who are interested in plant material and in bulbs there are not ten thousand in the position to import direct. The protest against the operation of Quarantine 37 from amateurs is not limited to the owners of large estates, but as Mr. Elliot stated here yesterday every one who deals with these amateurs over the counter or by correspondence receives thousands of protests and inquiries for the reasons that exist for the elimination from American catalogues of hundreds of bulbs and plants formerly listed. Why cannot we get them? Now, if there is no good reason for excluding these things from commercial inquiry which is the only way which they can reach the amateur, or if there

Footnote: Most of the corrections herein were made in connection with the report furnished by the public reporter who evidently caught some sentences and phrases which were overlooked by the Department's reporter.

is a reason why they might be admitted, there are lots of those things which the florists are not interested in. There is no committee that is so far been mentioned that would be able to present those particular things to the Board, and it seems to me that that is an interest which is perhaps as important as any other.

DR. MARLATT: Wouldn't Mr. McFarland's committee be appropriate for that.

MR. BURDETT: My understanding of that explanation of Mr. McFarland's committee is that it is a committee representing the amateurs that desire to import direct under special permits.

DR. MARLATT: No, it covers the subject as he presented it. I just read the ~~four~~ five requests that he made.

MR. BURDETT: I did not see that.

MR. HENRY: Why cannot our committee handle that.

DR. BALL: I see no objection to both committees presenting it.

MR. HENRY: Thank you.

The conference adjourned at 10:30 A.M.

to a reason why they might be admitted. There are lots of those things which the Toronto are not interested in. There is no committee that is so far been mentioned that would be able to present those particular things to the Board, and it seems to me that that is an interest which is perhaps as important as any other.

MR. H. BLATT: Wouldn't Mr. McFarlane's committee be appropriate for that.

MR. MCCONNEY: By understanding of that explanation of Mr. McFarlane's committee is that it is a committee representing the members that desire to import direct under special permits.

DR. M. M. LITT: No, it covers the subject as he presented it. I just read the form requests that be made.

MR. MCCONNEY: I did not see that.

MR. MCCOY: Why cannot our committee handle that.

MR. HALL: I see no objection to both committees presenting it.

MR. MCCOY: Thank you.

The conference adjourned at 10:30 A.M.

Footnote: Most of the corrections herein were made in connection with the report furnished by the public reporter who evidently caught some sentences and phrases which were overlooked by the Department's reporters.